

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
TAMPA DIVISION**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Case No. 8:03-CR-77-T-30TBM

v.

SAMI AMIN AL-ARIAN, et al.,

Defendants.

_____ /

1. I, Neil Vidmar, declare as follows:

2. I am Russell M. Robinson II Professor of Law at Duke Law School and Professor of Psychology at Duke University.¹ I earned my Ph.D. in Psychology at the University of Illinois in 1967. I have researched juries and jury decision-making in criminal and civil cases for over three decades. I have testified or consulted about trial prejudice in criminal cases in the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and England. I have written articles on trial prejudice that have appeared in law reviews and peer-reviewed psychology journals. Of particular relevance to this affidavit, I conducted empirical research about trial prejudice in relation to *United States v. John Walker Philip Lindh*, U.S. District Court, E. Dist, Va., Alexandria Division, Crim No. 02-37-A, Motion No. 6. In that research and a subsequent law review article, Vidmar, When All of Us Are Victims: Juror Prejudice and "Terrorist" Trials, 78 CHICAGO-KENT LAW REVIEW 1143 (2003), I explored American attitudes toward people accused of terrorism following the September 11 attacks. My curriculum vitae is attached to the Declaration as Appendix A.

¹ The opinions offered in this Declaration are my own professional opinions and not connected to my employment at Duke University. My opinions are not necessarily those of Duke University.

Background to the Opinion Offered in this Affidavit

3. On March 2, 2005, defence counsel for Mr. Sami Al-Arian contacted me. Counsel informed me of their concern about the ability of Mr. Al-Arian to obtain a fair trial in the Tampa venue where the case is currently scheduled for trial. They informed me that their concerns were raised by the answers to the juror questionnaire issued to jurors by the Court. At that time, I was superficially aware of the case, Mr. Al-Arian's controversial history at the University of South Florida and the role of that controversy in the 2004 Florida Senate elections. Counsel provided me with additional details about the extensive Tampa-area media coverage of the decade-long controversy involving Mr. Al-Arian, his public notoriety and his subsequent arrest on terrorism charges.

4. Defence counsel asked if I would examine the questionnaire answers and offer a tentative professional opinion about the likelihood that a jury chosen from the Tampa venue could be fair and impartial. I agreed to undertake this task.

5. Defence counsel express-mailed copies of the questionnaires to me and I received them on the morning of March 3, 2005. Aided by two Duke Law School student research assistants, I examined a random sample of the questionnaires focusing on questions 32, 35, 44, 45, 48, 49, 75, 76, 81, 82, with particular attention to the potential jurors' written explanations of why they answered the way that they did. In the limited time available, I formed a tentative opinion about the likelihood of prejudice. I stressed that this was a tentative opinion and subject to change upon a systematic examination of the questionnaire responses and the total media and community context in which the trial will be taking place.

6. It was my professional tentative opinion that the Court should be very concerned about obtaining a fair and impartial jury in the Tampa Division of the Middle District of Florida. Additionally, I stated that the Court should consider the responses to the juror questionnaires in the total context of the massive media coverage of all aspects of publicity about Mr. Al-Arian, including the effects of September 11 on American

attitudes towards terrorists and persons perceived to be associated with the ethnic backgrounds and religion of the September 11 attacks. I offered this opinion in a declaration, dated March 3, 2005.

7. Subsequent to my March 3 declaration, defence counsel asked me to review the complete set of juror questionnaire responses and offer a professional opinion about the likelihood that a jury chosen from the venue of the U.S. District Court, Middle District of Florida, Tampa Division. I have done so and offer this professional opinion to the Court.

Opinion

8. It is my professional opinion that the Tampa Division of the Middle District of Florida is centered in a community that contains many persons with deep and hostile attitudes toward Mr. Al Arian. There is extensive public awareness about him and about the charges that have been laid against him. The responses of the many jurors who expressed these attitudes in response to the questions need to be considered in the total context of the massive media coverage of all aspects of publicity about Mr. Al-Arian. This includes that fact that Mr. Al-Arian is a long-time resident of the jury venue and has been in the public eye for his outspoken views about Palestinians, Israel and the U.S. involvement in the Middle East. The fact that he is a resident of the community heightens a sense of personal relevance to the community and affects community attitudes. There is a reasonable likelihood that these negative community attitudes could influence even some jurors who would otherwise attempt to be impartial by influencing the way that they perceive and integrate trial evidence or consider the effect of a not guilty verdict on the community or the family, social and work settings in which they interact in their daily lives. The survey responses also show that many persons hold strong prejudicial attitudes toward persons who are perceived to be of Arab, Moslem or are otherwise perceived to be connected to the Middle East. Many jurors report that they believe that Moslems and persons of perceived Arab descent are seen to be disproportionately more violent than members of other ethnic groups. Some of this prejudice appears a result of personal contact with persons of Middle Eastern

descent in the Tampa Bay area community that is exacerbated by connecting them with the terrorist attack on America on September 11, 2001. Some juror respondents suggest that non-citizens residents with Middle East backgrounds should be deported and that while American citizens have the right to remain silent, the privilege does not extend to non-citizens.

9. While some of the general prejudice toward persons from the Middle East will likely exist in other venues as a result of September 11, 2001 or for other reasons, this general prejudice, in my professional opinion, serves as an aggravating factor in the Tampa Bay area community. Mr. Al-Arian is a local figure who has a long and controversial history in the area, creating community relevance and publicity. The publicity and notoriety that has occurred up to the present time but will likely increase as the trial begins and continue throughout the trial.

10. In short, it is my professional opinion that for all of the reasons summarized above there is a reasonable likelihood that a jury chosen from a jury pool of the Middle District of Florida, Tampa Division will not provide a fair and impartial hearing for the defendant, Mr. Al-Arian.

Basis of Opinion

A Framework for Considering Prejudicial Attitudes and Beliefs

11. While research on juries indicates that, in general, they perform their tasks well,² this general performance must be put in the context that procedural law provides remedies for exceptional cases, such as instances in which individual jurors or whole jury pools are tainted by biases. In an article on juror prejudice in a leading peer-reviewed journal,³ I set forth a framework for analyzing trial prejudice that incorporates forms of

² E.g. VALERIE HANS AND NEIL VIDMAR, JUDGING THE JURY (1986); Vidmar and Diamond, Juries and Expert Evidence, 66 BROOKLYN LAW REVIEW 1121 (2001).

³ Vidmar, Case Studies of Pre- and Midtrial Prejudice in Criminal and Civil Litigation, 26 LAW AND HUMAN BEHAVIOR 73 (2002).

prejudice recognized in American case law.⁴ The framework describes four categories of prejudice: interest prejudice, specific prejudice, generic prejudice and conformity prejudice. Each of these categories is relevant to potential trial prejudice in the Al-Arian case.

12. *Specific prejudice* exists when the juror holds attitudes or beliefs about specific issues in the case at trial that prevent the juror from deciding the case with an open mind. These attitudes and beliefs may result from many life experiences, including media coverage of issues and social interactions through rumor and gossip with other persons who know and are affected by the event. Newspaper coverage of events both helps to create public perceptions and reflects community interests and attitudes. Psychological research has shown, moreover, that prejudicial attitudes and beliefs can affect the way that trial evidence is perceived and evaluated, with the juror tending to accept evidence consistent with his or her prior beliefs and rejecting evidence inconsistent with those beliefs. In turn, the juror constructs narratives or stories of causation and guilt based around those beliefs.⁵

13. *Interest prejudice* involves prejudices arising from a juror having a direct or indirect stake in the outcome of the trial.⁶ As Judge Gertner and Professor Mizner observe, case law has recognized, for example, that someone owning stock in a company involved in litigation or suffering from an injury similar to a plaintiff's complaint may be deemed to be not impartial.⁷ As I have indicated in my article based on the John Walker

⁴ Vidmar, Case Studies of Pre- and Midtrial Prejudice in Criminal and Civil Litigation, 26 LAW AND HUMAN BEHAVIOR 73 (2002).

⁵ See, e.g., Pennington and Hastie, A Cognitive Theory of Juror Decision Making: The Story Model, 13 CARDOZO LAW REVIEW 519 (1991); Pennington and Hastie, Explaining the Evidence: Tests of the Story Model for Juror Decision Making, 62 JOURNAL OF PERSONALITY AND SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY 189 (1982); Holstein, Juror's Interpretation and Jury Decision Making, 9 LAW AND HUMAN BEHAVIOR 83 (1985); Casper et al., Juror Decision Making, Attitudes and Hindsight Bias, 13 LAW AND HUMAN BEHAVIOR, 291 (1989); Smith and Studebaker, What Do You Expect?: The Effect of People's Knowledge of Crime Categories on Fact Finding, 20 LAW AND HUMAN BEHAVIOR 517 (1996).

⁶ Id.

⁷ NANCY GERTNER AND JUDITH MIZNER, THE LAW OF JURIES (1997) at Chapter 5

Lindh case, the terrorist attacks of September 11 and its aftermath have created fears not only about future physical attacks but also perceived threats to American values and culture.⁸ Research has demonstrated that when deep-rooted cultural and personal values are threatened, people respond with hostility to persons who are perceived as outsiders or otherwise different.⁹

14. *Generic prejudice* involves the transferring of pre-existing prejudices about categories of persons or other entities to the trial setting. Generic prejudices come into play in the present case because jury questionnaire responses demonstrate very strong prejudicial attitudes toward Palestinians, Arabs and people of the Moslem faith or perceived Moslem faith. In short, the category of person to which Mr. Al-Arian is perceived to belong appears to invoke assumptions of guilt in addition to the specific prejudice arising out of the long history of negative publicity leading up to and including the charges against the defendant.

15. *Conformity prejudice* exists when the juror perceives that there is such strong community reaction in favor of a particular trial outcome that he or she is inclined to reach a verdict consistent with that perceived consensus rather than an impartial evaluation of the evidence. The bombing of the Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma in April 1995 with the loss of so many lives also caused discussion, rumor and gossip

⁸ Neil Vidmar, When All of Us Are Victims: Juror Prejudice and "Terrorist" Trials, 78 CHICAGO-KENT LAW REVIEW 1143 (2003).

⁹ See, e.g., Greenberg et al. Terror Management Theory of Self Esteem and Cultural Worldviews: Empirical Assessments and Conceptual Refinements, in MARK ZANNA, Ed., ADVANCES IN EXPERIMENTAL SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY, Vol. 29, 61(1997); Greenberg et al., Evidence For Terror Management Theory II: The Effects of Mortality Salience on Reactions To Those Who Threaten or Bolster the Cultural World View 58 JOURNAL OF PERSONALITY AND SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY 308 (1990); Florian and Mikulincer, Fear of Death and the Judgment of Social Transgressions: A Multidimensional Test of Terror Management Theory, 73 JOURNAL OF PERSONALITY AND SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY 369 (1997); Miller et al., Accounting for Evil and Cruelty: Is to Explain to Condone?, 3 PERSONALITY AND SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY REVIEW 254 (1999); Fishfader et al. Evidential and Extralegal Factors in Juror Decisions: Presentation Mode, Retention and Level of Emotionality 20 LAW AND HUMAN BEHAVIOR 565 (1966); Kerr et al., On the Effectiveness of Voir Dire In Criminal Cases With Prejudicial Pretrial Publicity: An Empirical Study 40 AMERICAN UNIVERSITY LAW REVIEW 665 (1991); Kramer et al. Pretrial Publicity, Judicial Remedies and Jury Bias , 14 LAW AND HUMAN BEHAVIOR 409 (1990); Ogloff and Vidmar, The Impact Of Pretrial Publicity On Jurors: A Study To Compare The Effects Of Television And Print Media In A Child Sex Abuse Case , 18 LAW AND HUMAN BEHAVIOR 507 (1994). On the other hand, there is evidence that strong emotional sympathies for victims also adversely affect rational decision making in verdicts , see Feigenson, Sympathy and Legal Judgment: A Psychological Analysis, 65 TENNESSEE LAW REVIEW 1 (1997) for a review.

throughout the United States. It threatened values and evoked calls for the death penalty as punishment. Importantly, citizens of Oklahoma City, where the bombing occurred, were stronger in their reactions and calls for justice than other Oklahoma communities. Indeed, after reviewing testimony and survey data Judge Maitch of the U.S. District Court concluded that "the entire state had become a unified community, sharing the emotional trauma of those who had become directly victimized."¹⁰ In the decision to move the trial from Oklahoma Judge Maitch reviewed many sources of evidence and concluded that Oklahomans were "united as a family," that there was "extraordinary provocation of their emotions of anger and vengeance," that there was "a prevailing belief that some action must be taken to make things right again," and that the common reference in articulating these feelings was "'seeing that justice is done.'"

16. Judge Maitch's conclusion in *McVeigh* is consistent with social science research that goes at least as far back as the founding of the field of modern sociology. Emile Durkheim observed in 1893: "As for the social character of [penal] reaction, it comes from the social nature of the offended sentiments. Because they are found in all consciences, the infraction committed arouses in those who have evidence of it or who learn of its existence the same indignation. Everybody is attacked; consequently, everybody opposes the attack. Not only is the reaction general, but it is collective.... It is not produced isolatedly in each one but with a totality and a unity of purpose..."¹¹

17. In the present case involving Mr. Al-Arian there is evidence from the juror questionnaire responses that all of these four forms of prejudice are at play in the Tampa Bay Area.

The Juror Questionnaire Responses

Response Rates

¹⁰ *U.S. v. McVeigh*, 955 F. Supp.1281 (D. Colo. 1997); see also *U.S. v. McVeigh* F. Supp. 1467, 1473 W.D. Okla. 1996)

¹¹ Cited in Neil Vidmar, Retributive Justice: Its Social Context, in M. Ross and D.T. Miller, eds., *THE JUSTICE MOTIVE IN EVERYDAY LIFE*, 291 (Cambridge U Press, 2001).

18. It is my understanding that a total of 500 questionnaires were mailed to potential jurors for the Al-Arian case but only 328 were returned. Defense counsel have informed me that they have made inquiries about the high non-response rate (34.4%), but they have been unable to obtain an explanation as to why it was so high. From both a social science and legal perspective, this is a matter of serious concern. Unlike a survey conducted for commercial or other purposes this survey was an official court command to respond and answer questions under oath. It did not require the juror to write his or her name and while the name might ultimately be revealed in court a substantial degree of privacy was implied. Did people not respond because they did not want to serve for such a lengthy and controversial trial or because they were afraid of serving on the jury in this particular case (See paragraphs 32 and 33, *infra*)? Was it because their minds may already have been made up about the case? Did the failure of these persons to respond distort the representativeness of the jury pool in some unknown way? Is the demographic makeup of the persons who responded different from responses to jury summonses in other jury trials, particularly high profile trials?

19. In the opinion that follows I make an assumption that the jury questionnaires are a representative sample of the eligible jury population, but with the important qualifications raised in paragraph 18.

Specific Prejudice

20. It is important to observe that mass media coverage of Mr. Al-Arian's controversial relationship with Florida Southern University, the charges against him and about his upcoming trial has been exceptional. A search of <tbo.com>, the website of the *Tampa Tribune*, revealed that in the past six months alone (10-21-04 to 4-19-05) there have been 46 articles relating to Mr. Al-Arian. The *St. Petersburg Times* listed 50 articles from October, 2004 through April 22, 2005. I did not conduct a systematic content analysis of the articles, but the extent of the coverage is the important point because news coverage reflects public interest. If the public is uninterested in a story

media coverage tends to fade away. However, in the case of Mr. Al-Arian even routine court proceedings are covered, including a website posting of the indictment against him. It is important to observe that even when news coverage is factually neutral, members of the community may place their own interpretations on it as a result of their own biases and beliefs and their discussions of the meanings of the news with family members, friends and co-workers. The fact that the Al-Arian case was raised in the Castor-Deutsch Senatorial primary race is a further indicant of public awareness and attitudes about Mr. Al-Arian's notoriety.

21. While a few of the 328 potential jurors who responded to the questionnaire did not answer any questions beyond pleading hardship (e.g., Juror 001), and some others said they did not follow the case closely, knowledge about the case, as reflected in their responses, is widespread in the community. Even questionnaire respondents who expressed neutrality about Mr. Al-Arian's guilt or innocence indicated knowledge about the case from media and other coverage.

22. Recall that Q81 asked "Is there any reason that you could not be completely fair and impartial to the defendants in this case?" Question 82 asked the same question about being fair and impartial to the government and then asked the juror to explain "yes" answers to either of these two questions. However, questions 80, 81 and 82 were not the only places on the questionnaire where the jurors were asked to answer questions about their potential biases and offered the opportunity to explain their answers in their own words. Question 40c asked whether the juror had any connection with the defendants in the case and or whether they had heard or read about it. This question also allowed the juror an opportunity to express his or her opinion. Question 41 offered a similar opportunity and so did Question 42a, which asked "What were your reactions or impressions based on what you saw, read or heard?" Questions 43b offered a similar opportunity for self-expression. Questions 44 and 45 asked about the Senatorial Primary Race controversy about Mr. Al-Arian and again offered the opportunity for jurors to state their impressions and feelings in their own words. Question 44d specifically asked the juror: "Based on this opinion, would it make it difficult for you to sit as a fair and

impartial juror in this type of case?” and allowed space to express the reason(s) for the opinion. Question 48 asked: “Is there anything you have seen, heard or read about that would interfere with your ability to render a fair verdict in this case solely on the evidence presented in court?” Question 49 asked: “Have you formed an opinion as to the innocence or guilt of any of the defendants in this case before hearing the evidence?” and offered the options of “Guilty,” “Innocent” and “No Decision” followed by “Please explain what led to your position.” Question 50 asked about opinions on pre-trial rulings and asked for an explanation. Question 52 that asked about the conflict between Israel and the Palestinians also allowed another opportunity for self-expression.

23. In short, the jury questionnaire offered many opportunities for the juror to express in his or her own words impressions and any biases about the case that arose from media coverage and from discussions about the case with family members, co-workers, friends and acquaintances. The responses offered by the jurors provide important insights into the degree of community attitudes and beliefs about Mr. Al-Arian and his likely guilt in the charges that have been laid against him. They also provide an opportunity to examine inconsistencies in the attitudes and beliefs of jurors who state that they can be fair and impartial in their response to Question 81.

Responses of jurors Who Stated Lack of Impartiality: Question 81

24. I turn first to consider the juror responses to Question 81 (and/or responses to Questions 80 and 82). Of 328 jurors returning questionnaires, 112 indicated that they could not be fair and impartial jurors. In Appendix B, attached to this Declaration, I report an edited version of many of the responses to questions 40 through 52 and Questions 80, 81 and 82. The Court has access to the complete set of juror questionnaires to check against any bias in my editing. I also considered other questions in drawing my opinion, particularly Questions 50, 52, 56, 57, and Questions 72-78. My goal in constructing Appendix B was to provide insight into the primary basis upon which I have drawn my opinion about the strength and extent of biased attitudes toward, and beliefs about, Mr. Al-Arian and his likely guilt in the charges that have been made against him.

25. From Appendix B, consider an illustrative sample of jurors who declared themselves biased in response to Question 81. The responses illustrate the effects of media and discussion on the attitudes and beliefs of the jurors.

Juror 003: Q40-Yes. About Sami Al-Arian and how he funded terrorism; Q42-Yes. Newspaper and News a. That he is somehow involved; Q 44-Yes. About how she handled or didn't handle the situation; I feel he is somehow involved; yes (I am biased). Q48-Yes (I am biased); Q49-Guilty. Everything that I have read, and who he is associated with. Q81-Yes (biased); Q82- No. I believe that somehow he is involved.

Juror 009: Q40-Yes Sami Al-Arian, read newspapers, O'Reilley's Spin Zone TV Newscasts and CNN News, O'Reilley said he believed Al-Arian was guilty and he would spy on him everywhere he went in order to get evidence; Q42-Yes. I heard that while Al-Arian was a Professor at U. of South Florida he was also raising money to sponsor terrorist groups. I have discussed the case with my husband and sister-in-law. I was angry; Q44-Yes. I feel he is guilty and should be punished. Yes, it (election controversy) would (bias me); Q45-Yes. Mr. Martinez accused Mrs. Castor of doing nothing when the accusations about Al-Arian were mad public; I feel he is guilty. Yes (I would be biased); Q48-Yes (bias); Q49-Guilty. Government (law officials) found evidence which incriminates him. Q81-Yes (biased); Q82-Yes. Personal.

Juror 067: Q40-Yes. I saw newscasts, read it in the newspaper and heard it on the radio. I did not think it was right for Dr. Al-Arian to remain employed at USF with such serious allegations against him; Q44-Yes. There were allegations that stated that Betty Castor knew Al-Arian was a terrorist supporter. I feel that it was wrong to fund terrorist groups. I don't think I would be impartial because I have heard too much about Dr. Sami Al-Arian. I already have an impression he funded terrorist groups; Q46-Yes. I saw the ads on TV stating that Betty Castor knew Al-Arian funded and was a member of a terrorist group. I have formed the opinion that he funded a terrorist group. Yes, I already have an impression of the defendant; Q48-Yes (biased); Q49-Guilty. The news coverage on the case led me to believe it. Q81-Yes (biased); Q82-Yes. I have heard a lot of media coverage and have the impression Al-Arian funded a terrorist group.

Juror 124: Q42-If Sami Al-Arian is on record for supporting these "charitable" groups that are actually terrorist groups, then I believe that he is someone who supports/incites terrorist attacks or activities against the United States. Q44-Right now I think he is guilty. There would have to be overwhelming evidence to convince me of his innocence. I don't know if that labels me impartial or not.; Q46-Yes (not impartial); Q49-Guilty. Footage aired on TV news allegedly shows Sami Al-Arian speaking in support of terrorist groups and activities. Q50-Sami

Al-Arian has ties directly or indirectly to Qaida or other terrorist groups. Q81-Yes; Q82-I already think he is guilty based on news and publicity. I am assuming that it means that I am not impartial.

Juror 204: Q42-I wondered why it took so long to build a case against Dr. Al-Arian. It seems like the evidence was there a long time before they arrested him. Q43-I wondered how he could stay and live in this country without being asked to leave. Q44-I believe on what I have seen on TV, he should have been arrested a long time before he was. Yes, I think he is 99.9% likely to be guilty of what he is charged with based on what I have seen heard, and read on TV and in the newspaper; Q45-I believe that Dr. Al-Arian along with his partners helped to raise money and funnel that money to organizations that are against the U.S. Yes, having lived with the hate that Arabs and Palestinians have for the U.S. makes me wonder why we would give assistance to these types of individuals or countries; Q48-Yes (biased); Q49-Guilty. Everything that I have read and heard about this case has led me to believe that he and his group are guilty. Q81-Yes (biased); Q82-I would have a hard time being fair and impartial to people who take life for granted.

Juror 316: Q42-I feel they are both guilty of terrorism acts against the U.S.; Q44-I feel Al-Arian is a threat either directly or indirectly to the U.S. citizens, and that he is guilty of the crimes as charged. Yes, my opinions are formed and extremely unlikely to change; Q45-What I've read/heard points to Al-Arian's guilt when he's labeled a terrorist. Yes, very difficult to be impartial. Q48-Yes (biased); Q49-Guilty. Reports on the defendant's connection to terrorist organizations, money laundering charges, monies paid to individuals to carry out suicide attacks; Q81-Yes; Q82-Terrorism charges are hard to swallow after 9/11; if you live in America you should not be involved in activities that are harmful to American citizens.

Juror 480: Q40-Too much to state here--read and followed everything I could. I have a daughter attending USF in Tampa and the jerk was a professor there. Q42-Sami Al-Arian looks like a Moslem Radical to me; Q43-Sami is probably one of those "kill the infidels;" Q44-He's probably had a hand in fund raising for terror organizations. ...What do you think! I saw him all sweaty and screaming with laundry wrapped on his head on those film clips. Looked obvious to me. Q45-Look back at 44d. I think he's guilty of fund raising for terrorists. I would say so. Yes. Q48-Yes; Q49-Guilty. What I've read and seen in the media you can take my vote now and save all that taxpayer money. Q66-Are you kidding? Remember 911? Q81-Yes (not impartial); Q82-I think Sami is guilty!

26. Appendix B and the above sample of cases show that many jurors have very strong biased attitudes derived from media accounts and other sources. Considering only

the responses to Questions 80, 81 and 82, there were 112 jurors who declared themselves to be not impartial.

Other Jurors Expressed Strong Biases

27. A closer examination of jurors who checked “No” to Question 81, which asked if there was any reason they could not be fair and impartial to the defendants in this case made other comments that raised very serious doubts about their lack of impartiality. Consider some selected examples documented in Appendix B.

Juror 58: Q40-Guilty; Q42-Guilty; Q44-Who knows. Government only tells us what they want us to know. Yes (difficult to sit as a fair and unbiased juror); Q48-Yes (interfere with ability to render a fair verdict); Q49-Guilty, 9/11.

Juror 71: Q40-Yes. One of the defendants was a professor at USF and currently is in jail; Q42-They are guilty! Q44-Yes. Disgusted by the entire event. I would not be a fair juror on this trial. I think he’s guilty. Yes (difficult to sit as a fair and impartial juror); Q49-Guilty.

Juror 120: Q 40-They are accused of funding terrorist activities and plots and make out like ordinary people; Q42-It has been going on so long, most of the facts are forgotten by all; Q44-I’m not sure; Q45-Outrage that he’s at least somewhat behind this; I’m not sure (difficult to sit as fair and impartial juror); Q49-Guilty. The government has tons of evidence of at least some acts and has been shown these people could pull a 9/11 on us. *They were in Tampa.* (italics added).

Juror 139: Q40-TV news reports, newspaper articles, comments from my parents; Q42-I feel that Sami Al-Arian and his supporters are liars and terrorists and that they use our freedoms in the U.S. as a cover for their terrorist activities; Q43-I think he is a terrorist; Q44-I think he is a terrorist; Yes (difficult to sit as fair and impartial juror); Q49-Guilty. What I have read and heard from the newspapers and my parents.

Juror 269: Q44-Yes (difficult to sit as fair and impartial juror); Q45-The man is guilty. He should be put away. Yes (difficult to sit as fair and impartial juror); Q48-Yes (difficult to render a fair verdict); Q49-Guilty. Just everything that happened. Q81-*No* (italics added); Q83-I think the men are guilty.

Juror 271: Q42-Why don’t they stay in their countries if they hate us? Q44-Yes (difficult to sit as fair and impartial juror); Q45-Yes (difficult to sit as fair and

impartial juror); Q48-Yes. Evidence seems conclusive; Q49-Guilty. I think for sure. Media coverage. Q81-No; Q83-I guess 9/11 weighs heavily on all Americans.

Juror 286: Q40-I have read and heard that Al-Arian was funneling funds to Alquaaid and other Arab groups opposed to the U.S.; Q42-Suspicious that they did what was alleged; Q44-I am suspicious he is guilty of what he is accused of. It would be uncomfortable with my ability to be fair to the accused parties because of what is going on in Iraq; Q45-I am suspect about his guilt. Not sure but uncomfortable; Q48-No; Q49-No decision; Q 81-No.

Juror 320: Q40-Newspaper and TV stories leave me to believe they are all guilty. They had the funds and opportunity to do these things; Q42-Upset that others can come to America and get away with anything. Q44-The man and all of his co-defendants are guilty! Yes (difficult to sit as fair and impartial juror); Q45-I feel that the group had been planning some terrorist activities for a long time. They had been spreading the word to others around the country for more support and were never stopped. Yes (difficult to sit as fair and impartial juror); Q48-Yes; Q49-Guilty. As stated before, the group (as to reports on TV and newspapers) had plenty of papers, etc. which proved what they were doing. Q80-No. I feel the government will have enough evidence to prove their case before coming to court or they will stall for more time.

Juror 365: All blank except Q49-Guilty.

Juror 496: Q40-Sami Al-Arian participation in funding his native land and for war purposes against the U.S.; Q42-Anger fear, how could this happen under our noses? Q44-Yes (difficult to sit as fair and impartial juror); Q48-No. Q49-Guilty. Al-Arian has too many coincidences leading towards a guilty verdict

Combining All Jurors With Biases

28. In my professional opinion 17 additional jurors should be added to the 112 in Paragraph 26: Jurors number 13,14, 28, 40, 50, 58, 70,95, 120, 139, 304, 310, 314, 337, 350, 351, and 129.

29. In short 129 persons expressed bias against Mr. Al-Arian and /or his co-defendants for a total of 129 out of 328 persons who returned the questionnaire. Put in percentage terms, 39 percent of returned questionnaires showed bias, with many jurors indicating very strong bias.

Interest Prejudice in the Community: The Effects of 9/11/01

30. In my research for the John Walker Lindh ("American Taliban") case I documented the strong reactions that the attacks of 9/11 had on the American Public. The attacks were seen not only in terms of physical fear, but also feelings of hostility arising from strong emotional reactions that American values and culture were being attacked. Many respondents mentioned the 9/11 attacks on various questions in addition to Question 36 that asked respondents if they believed Palestinians were involved in the attacks of 9/11/. Consider selected examples: Juror 004, Q34: "Sept.11;" Juror 008, Q 66: "I have family and friends living in New York and are still suffering from 9/11 attack;" Juror 018, Q66: "The events of 2001 and subsequent involvement impact on entire society...;" Juror 025, Q82: "As with 9/11 , these people demonstrate the ability to live amongst us unnoticed...;" Juror 038, Q66: "Every American was affected by 9/11 & I wonder and fear what could be next;" Juror 362, Q32: "Friends and family associates murdered on 9-11-01."

31. Of course the September 11 attacks will be in the minds of jurors in any venue in the United States. However, in my professional opinion, there is a reasonable probability that the issue is exacerbated in the Tampa Bay area from which the jurors have been drawn because of the exceptional media publicity and the fact that the charges involve events that allegedly occurred right in the community in which the respondents lived.

Interest Prejudice: Fear of Being a Juror in This Case

32. Consider Juror 280's answer to Q83: Due to the nature of the case, I would potentially fear for the safety of self and family." Juror 414 said to Q83: "It is important my identity be kept secret from the defendants and from the media." Juror 343's answer to Q83 was: "What if these defendants are found guilty? What about retaliation against the jurors? What's to stop their terrorist affiliates from coming after us? Or bombing the courthouse, etc.(?)." Similarly, Juror 367 wrote on Q83: "I think the biggest fear of

people to serve on this jury will be reprisal. How do you know if you are in harm's way from these people? I feel intimidated." Juror 422 said to Q 83: "If these men are guilty and associated with terrorists how safe will it be for myself and family?" Juror 178's answer to Q82: "I am worried that my fear of terrorists would affect me to be fair and impartial" Juror 148 added to Q82: "...and my personal fear of terror."

33. I formulated my opinion about the amount of community prejudice well before I had an insight about these questions. The potential relevance of these comments occurred to me only while writing the Declaration and I decided they should be brought to the Court's attention. The above examples were the only ones that I could identify in a re-review of the juror questionnaires. Nevertheless, I offer the suggestion that they are another indicant of community concern about this case that might be less likely in some other venue. (They could also possibly explain the answers of some jurors who stated they held prejudice as an attempt to avoid jury duty.) Most important they offer a hypothesis as to the reasons that the response rate to the Court summons was so low, as discussed in Paragraph 18. I have drawn the matter to the Court's attention and have no more to say on the matter.

Generic Prejudice Regarding Moslems, Arabs/ Palestinians and Non-citizens

34. Many questions throughout the questionnaire gave respondents the specific opportunity to express any attitudes or beliefs that they had about Palestinians and other Arabs, Moslems (i.e., Questions 30-36; 52-58; 64 and 66) and the rights of non-citizens to be entitled to the same constitutional protections that citizens are accorded (i.e., Questions 72-78). Both persons who declared that they could not be impartial and those who either did not answer questions or who declared themselves to be impartial on the matter of Mr. Al-Arian's guilt expressed many beliefs and attitudes that show stereotyping of Arabs and Moslems. In response to questions 33-36 approximately 50 percent (49.6%) of jurors expressed a view that Arabs/Palestinians or Muslims were more violent than other ethnic groups or were responsible in some way for the September 11 attacks on the United States. Many jurors would not accord non-citizens

the same rights of free speech that citizens have, particularly when it is seen as, “espousing terrorism” (Juror 012) or “degrading the USA” (e.g., Juror 017) or in limited fashion “as long as it does not endanger America.” (e.g., Juror 090).

35. It is likely that these attitudes will exist in other American communities, but in the light of widespread negative publicity about Mr. Al-Arian, his relevance to the Tampa Bay area community from which jurors are drawn and the extremely negative attitudes and beliefs arising from the publicity, it is my professional opinion that these general prejudices will be more exaggerated than elsewhere.

Community/ Conformity Prejudice

36. It is clear from juror responses, both those admitting bias and those who did not express opinions on guilt, that extensive Tampa Bay area television, radio and newspaper accounts about Mr. Al-Arian have been watched and read by the whole community. It is an event relevant to the whole community because of the fact that Mr. Al-Arian’s residence, employment, and publicized speeches and alleged terrorist-supporting activities have occurred in the community. As a group the jurors who answered the questionnaire appear very aware of many details about Mr. Al-Arian. While the charges against Mr. Al-Arian are not based on a community trauma as deep as the Oklahoma City bombing ten years ago, there is a clear group of jurors who hold deep and hostile attitudes toward the accused. As the trial date nears media coverage will increase and so will discussion among members of the community. Jurors will be reminded of the strong, hostile attitudes in the community and be cognizant that a not guilty verdict will be met with outrage by some of their friends, family and co-workers. If the trial evidence about guilt is in equipoise there is, in my professional opinion, a reasonable probability that jurors, aware of this community feeling, will tilt toward a verdict of guilt. These social pressures will be much less in a community where the publicity is less and Mr. Al-Arian has less community relevance.

Opinion

37. Extensive research on the effects of pretrial publicity¹² indicates that its effects can be manifested at various points in the trial process and jeopardize an impartial evaluation of the evidence: It can prejudice jurors' initial assumptions about a defendant's guilt; it can improperly influence the evaluation of evidence through selective attention and weighting of evidence consistent with pre-existing biases; it can influence pre-deliberation preferences of verdicts; it can influence the initial distribution of juror verdicts that lead to the final verdict; it can promote jury deliberations that enhances the initial biases of the jurors; It can instigate a "rotten apple" effect whereby one or more tainted jurors infect other jurors with emotional appeals during deliberation; In the event that the evidence of guilt is near equipoise at the end of deliberations, it can improperly tilt the jury toward a guilt verdict. I consider all of these factors in assessing the responses by jurors who returned the questionnaire sent by the Court.

38. It is my professional opinion that the Tampa Division of the Middle District of Florida is centered in a community that contains many persons with deep and hostile attitudes toward Mr. Al Arian. There is extensive public awareness about him and about the charges that have been laid against him. The responses of the many jurors who expressed these attitudes in response to the questions need to be considered in the total context of the massive media coverage of all aspects of publicity about Mr. Al-Arian. This includes that fact that Mr. Al-Arian is a long-time resident of the jury venue and has been in the public eye for his outspoken views about Palestinians, Israel and the U.S. involvement in the Middle East. The fact that he is a resident of the community heightens a sense of personal relevance to the community and affects community attitudes. There is a reasonable likelihood that these negative community attitudes could influence even some jurors who would otherwise attempt to be impartial by influencing the way that they perceive and integrate trial evidence or consider the effect of a not

¹² Vidmar, Case Studies of Pre- and Midtrial Prejudice in Criminal and Civil Litigation, 26 LAW AND HUMAN BEHAVIOR 73 (2002); see also 26 Law and Human Behavior, Whole Issue No.1, February 2002; Studebaker et al., Assessing Pretrial Publicity Effects: Integrating Content Analytic Results, 24 LAW AND HUMAN BEHAVIOR 317 (2002). Jon Bruschke and William Loges, FREE PRESS VERSUS FAIR TRIALS: EXAMINING PUBLICITY'S ROLE IN TRIAL OUTCOMES (2004)

guilty verdict on the community or the family, social and work settings in which they interact in their daily lives. The survey responses also show that many persons hold strong prejudicial attitudes toward persons who are perceived to be of Arab, Moslem or are otherwise perceived to be connected to the Middle East. Many jurors report that they believe that Moslems and persons of perceived Arab descent are seen to be disproportionately more violent than members of other ethnic groups. Some of this prejudice appears a result of personal contact with persons of Middle Eastern descent in the Tampa Bay area community that is exacerbated by connecting them with the terrorist attack on America on September 11, 2001. Some juror respondents suggest that non-citizens residents with Middle East backgrounds should be deported and that while American citizens have the right to remain silent the privilege does not extend to non-citizens.

39. While some of the general prejudice toward persons from the Middle East will likely exist in other venues as a result of September 11, 2001 or for other reasons, this general prejudice, in my professional opinion, serves as an aggravating factor in the Tampa Bay area community. Mr. Al-Arian is a local figure who has a long and controversial history in the area, creating community relevance and publicity. The publicity and notoriety that has occurred up to the present time but will increase as the trial begins and continue throughout the trial and afterward.

40. In short, it is my professional opinion that for all of the reasons summarized in this Declaration there is a reasonable probability that a jury chosen from a jury pool of the Middle District of Florida, Tampa Division will not provide a fair and impartial hearing for the defendant, Mr. Al-Arian.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Signed this 28th of April, 2005 in Durham, North Carolina.

Neil J. Vidmar

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Neil J. Vidmar", written over a horizontal line.

Patricia E. Roz
Kataray
5/12/05 -

Appendix A: Curriculum Vita of Neil Vidmar

April 2005

NEIL (JOSEPH) VIDMAR
Russell M. Robinson, II Professor of Law;
Professor of Psychology, Duke University

Business Address: Duke University School of Law
Box 90360
Durham, North Carolina 27708-0360

Phone: Law School: (919) 613-7090
FAX Number: (919) 613-7231
INTERNET: VIDMAR@LAW.DUKE.EDU
Home: (919) 489-7729

Birthdate: November 25, 1940

UNIVERSITY EDUCATION

A.B. June, 1962, cum laude
MacMurray College, Jacksonville, Illinois
Major: psychology; Minor: sociology

M.A. October, 1965
University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois
Major: psychology

Ph.D. June, 1967
University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois
Major: social psychology
Minors: sociology, experimental psychology

ACADEMIC WORK EXPERIENCE

1962-1963 USPHS Fellow, University of Illinois

1963-1966 Teaching and/or Research Assistant
Department of Psychology
University of Illinois

1966-67 Research Associate, Department of Psychology,
University of Illinois

1967 (Summer) Research Associate
Danville Veterans Administration Hospital
Danville, Illinois

1967-1971 Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology
University of Western Ontario, London, CANADA

1971-1980 Associate Professor, Department of Psychology

University of Western Ontario, London, CANADA

- 1973-1974** On leave as Russell Sage Resident in Law and Social Science: Yale Law School, New Haven, Conn.
- 1974-1975** On leave as Visiting Research Fellow, Battelle Seattle Research Center, 4000 N.E., 41st St. Seattle, Wa.
- 1981-1990** Professor of Psychology; Professor of Law, University of Western Ontario.
- 1984** On leave as Visiting Professor, Osgoode Hall Law School, York University, Downsview, Ontario.
- 1986** Visiting Professor of Law, Osgoode Hall Law School, York University, Downsview, Ontario.
- 1986-1987** Vice President for Research (Part-time) Private Adjudication Center of Duke University School of Law, Durham, N.C.
- 1987-1989** Visiting Professor of Law and Social Science, Duke University School of Law.
1989-1996 Professor of Social Science and Law, Duke University School of Law; Vice President and Research Director, the Private Adjudication Center.
- 1996-** Russell M. Robinson, II Professor of Law; Professor of Psychology, Duke University

OTHER EDUCATION/WORK EXPERIENCE

- 1962** Certificate of Competency of Coal Miner, State Miner's Examining Board, Dept. of Mines and Minerals, State of Illinois, March 1962.

AWARDS

Canada Council Leave Fellowship (Summer, 1973)
Russell Sage Foundation Residency Fellowship (1973-1974)
Battelle Fellowship (1974-1975)
Fellow, American Psychological Association, Divisions 9 and 41
Fellow, American Psychological Society
Perry Nichols Fellowship (1992)
Summer Research Fellowship, University of Osnabruck, Germany (1992)

MEMBERSHIP IN LEARNED SOCIETIES

American Psychological Society
Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues
American Psychology-Law Society
Law & Society Association
Association of American Law Schools

SCHOLARLY DUTIES AND OFFICES

Editorial Board: (1977-1991; 1997-) Law and Human Behavior

Editorial Board (1974-1985) Journal of Applied Social Psychology
 Trustee (1977-1978) Law and Society Association
 Editorial Board Law and Society Review
 Trustee (1985-1987) Law and Society Association
 Board of Directors Canadian Law and Society Association
 Law and Justice Committee (1987-1996) National Research Council
 Advisory Board (1987-2000) Canadian Journal of Law and Society
 Treasurer (1987-1989) Law and Society Association
 Editorial Board (1992-) Psychology, Crime, and Law
 Section Chair: Law and The Social Sciences (1993) Association of American Law Schools
 Editorial Board: (1994- 2005) Legal and Criminological Psychology
 Editorial Board (1995-) Psychology, Public Policy and Law
 Editorial Board (2000-2003) Law & Social Inquiry
 Academic Advisory Board (2000-) Roscoe Pound Foundation
 Academic Advisory Board (2002-) Journal of Empirical Legal Studies
 Advisory Board. (1997-) Grant Sawyer Center for Justice Studies, U. Nevada Reno

LEGAL CONSULTING AND TESTIMONY

NAACP Legal Defense Fund's Capital Punishment Project (U.S.)
 Advisory Committee on the Jury, Law Reform Commission of Canada (1976-77)
 Consultant for Police Powers Project, Law Reform Commission of Canada (1977)
 Consultant for Solicitor General of Canada on Firearms Control Legislation
 Implementation
 Consultant for Committee on Statistics in the Courts: (U.S.) National Academy
 of Sciences
 Consultant for Canadian Law Information Council
 Ontario Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations: Expert Panel on
 Guiding Principle for Consumer Protection/Business Practices Strategies
 Ontario Ministry of the Attorney General: Access To Justice Project
 Ontario Ministry of the Attorney General: Independent Paralegals Project
 Law Reform Commission of Ontario: Punitive Damages Project
 Law and Justice Committee of the National Research Council, Washington, D.C.
 Lecturer:
 National College of the State Judiciary, Reno, Nevada (1974, 1975)
 Washington State Trial Lawyers Association (1975)
 Law Society of Upper Canada "Psychology and the Litigation Process" (1976)
 Association of American Law Schools (1986)
 American Bar Association
 Supreme Court of British Columbia (Canada)
 National Judicial Institute (Canada)
 Judging Science program (Duke University)
 Criminal Lawyers Association (Canada)
 Federal Judicial Center
 Texas Criminal Judges

Expert testimony and Consulting on Juries:

U.S.A. : Supreme Court of the United States; Ohio; Oklahoma; Oregon; Pennsylvania; North
 Carolina; California; Illinois; Connecticut; Florida; West Virginia
Canada : Supreme Court of Canada; Ontario; Newfoundland; Prince Edward Island; British
 Columbia; Saskatchewan; New Brunswick.
New Zealand (by affidavits);
Australia (via video-conference)
England and Wales (consulting: *R. v. Maxwell*; for prosecution in *R.v. Bowyer*)

TEACHING INTERESTS

Social Science Evidence in Law
The Psychology of the Litigation Process
The American Jury
Negotiation and Mediation
The Social and Psychological Context of Law
(Law and Society)
Conflict and Dispute Resolution
Social Psychology

RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

1. Summary

My early research was on conflict and group decision-making. Since about 1970 my scholarly efforts have been primarily at the interface of social science and law. I conducted a three-year field study of dispute resolution in a small claims court; undertook a number of in-depth field studies of grievances and disputing behavior; and conducted a study of the Ontario Business Practice Act. I recently completed a large scale project on procedural aspects of medical malpractice litigation which has resulted in a number of articles and a book. I am currently working of a large project involving civil juries in Arizona plus several smaller projects on that subject. Additionally, I conduct research on procedural justice and the social psychological dynamics of justice behavior. A special interest has been the psychology of retribution. Other projects involve the use and effects of experts on the tort system; and the empirical behavior of the tort system.

My scholarly interests also extend to criminal law. I have published articles pertaining to the death penalty and on jury behavior in criminal cases. I am presently conducting research on pretrial prejudice. This latter work includes empirical studies, but also places the subject of pretrial prejudice in the broader context of legal values and procedures. I have also edited a book that involves a comparative study of the jury systems of England, Canada, Scotland, Ireland, Australia, New Zealand, The United States, Russia and Spain.

2. Research Grants

- A. Six research grants from Canada Council on topics of conflict and group decision making between 1967 and 1976.
- B. Russell Sage Foundation (1976: \$22,000): Integrating Literature Review on Psychology and Law (with W. Loh)
- C. Canada Council (1977-79: \$18,000): Conflict and Procedural Justice
- D. Solicitor General of Canada (1977: \$10,000): Firearms Control
- E. Law and Society Association and National Science Foundation (1978: \$5,000): Legal Punishment Responses (with D. Miller)
- F. Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (1979: \$7,000): Small Claims Disputes
- G. The Donner Canadian Foundation (1980: \$120,000): The Small Claims Dispute Process
- H. Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (1980: \$9,800): Decision Making in Civil Juries
- I. Solicitor General of Canada (1981: \$10,000): Criminal Justice Issues and Voting Behavior

- J. Ontario Ministry of Transportation and Communication (1982: \$10,000): Public Attitudes toward Privacy (with D. Flaherty)
- K. Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (1983: \$20,700): A Study of the Ontario Business Practices Act (with J. Samuels)
- L. Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (1983: \$63,368): Arbitration and the Negotiation Process.
- M. Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (1986: \$24,903): Procedural Choice.
- N. Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (with T. Metzloff) (1987-1989: \$284,421): Procedures in Medical Malpractice Cases.
- O. Ontario Ministry of the Attorney General (with William Bogart (1987-88: \$94,000): Empirical Study of Access to Justice.
- P. State Justice Institute (with T. Metzloff) (1989 thru 1990: \$99,321): Impact of Procedural Reform on Malpractice Litigation.
- Q. Ontario Law Reform Commission (with B. Feldthusen) (1988-89: \$50,000): Subproject on Punitive Damages.
- R. Task Force on Independent Paralegals in Ontario, Ministry of the Attorney General (with W. A. Bogart) (1988-89: \$48,000) The Nature of Paralegal Activity in Ontario.
- S. Pima County, Arizona Civil Jury Study (January 1998-)
- T. National Science Foundation (1999-2001).

3. Scholarly Publications

A. Books:

Bermant, G., Nemeth, C. and Vidmar, N. (eds.) *PSYCHOLOGY AND THE LAW: RESEARCH FRONTIERS*: Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1976.

Hans, V., and Vidmar, N. *JUDGING THE JURY*. Plenum Press (March 1986). (published in the Japanese language by Gendaijinbun Publishing (2000)

Neil Vidmar, *MEDICAL MALPRACTICE AND THE AMERICAN JURY: CONFRONTING THE MYTHS ABOUT JURY INCOMPETENCE, DEEP POCKETS, AND OUTRAGEOUS DAMAGE AWARDS*, U. of Michigan Press (October 1995)

Neil Vidmar, ed., *WORLD JURY SYSTEMS*, Oxford England: Oxford University Press.(2000)

B. Articles:

1. Vidmar, N., Group composition and the risky shift. 6 *JOURNAL OF EXPERIMENTAL SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY* 153-166 (1970).
2. Vidmar, N. and Hackman, J.R. Inter-laboratory generalizability of small group research: an experimental study. 83 *JOURNAL OF SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY* 129-139 (1971).
3. Vidmar, N. and McGrath, J. E. Forces affecting success in negotiation groups. 15 *BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE* 154-163 (1970).
4. Hackman, J.R. and Vidmar, N. Effects of size and task type on group performance and member reactions. 33 *SOCIOMETRY* 37-54 (1970). This article has been reprinted in three books: (a) Ofshe, R. *INTERPERSONAL BEHAVIOR IN SMALL GROUPS*, Prentice Hall, (b) Marlowe, L. *BASIC TOPICS IN SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY*, Holbrook Press, 1972, (c) Cummings and Scott *READINGS IN*

ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR AND HUMAN PERFORMANCE, (d) Cathcart, Samovar, & Lustig
SMALL GROUP COMMUNICATION: A READER (4th ed.).

5. Vidmar, N. Effects of representational roles and mediators on negotiation effectiveness. 17 JOURNAL OF PERSONALITY AND SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY 48-58 (1971).
6. Ferguson, D.A. and Vidmar, N. Effects of group discussion on estimates of culturally appropriate risk levels. 20 JOURNAL OF PERSONALITY AND SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY, 436-445 (1971).
7. Vidmar, N. and Burdeny, T.C. Effects of group size and item type in the "group shift" effect. 4 CANADIAN JOURNAL OF BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE 393-407(1971).
8. Vidmar, N. Effects of decision alternatives on the verdicts and perceptions of simulated jurors. 22 JOURNAL OF PERSONALITY AND SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY 211-218 (1972). Also, reprinted in Kaufmann and Solomon (Eds.) READINGS IN SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY (1973).
9. Jackson, D., Hourany, L. and Vidmar, N. A four-dimensional interpretation of risk taking. 40 JOURNAL OF PERSONALITY 483-501(1972).
10. Vidmar, N. Effects of group discussion on category width judgments. 29 JOURNAL OF PERSONALITY AND SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY 187-195 (1974).
11. Rokeach, M. and Vidmar, N. Testimony concerning possible jury bias in a Black Panther murder trial. 3 JOURNAL OF APPLIED SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY, 19-29 (1973).
12. Vidmar, N. and Rokeach, M. Archie Bunker's bigotry: A study in selective perception and exposure. Journal of Communication, 1974, 24, 36-47. Also reprinted in A. Wells (Ed.), Mass Media and Society, 1975; C. Wilson (Ed.) Mind over Message; P. Adler (Ed.), All in the Family: A Critical Appraisal, 1979.
13. Vidmar, N. and Crinklaw, L. Attributing responsibility for an accident: a methodological and conceptual critique. Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 1974, 6, 113-130.
14. Sorrentino, R. and Vidmar, N. Research note: the short-term and long-term effects of a crisis. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1974, 38, 271-279.
15. Sorrentino, R., Vidmar, N. and Goodstadt, M. Opinion change in a crisis: Effects of the 1970 Canadian kidnapping crisis on political and ethnic attitudes. Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 1974, 6, 199-218. Also reprinted in W. E. Mann and L. Wheatcroft (eds.) Canada: A Sociological Profile, Toronto: Copp Clark, 1976.
16. Vidmar, N. and Ellsworth, P. Public opinion and the death penalty. Stanford Law Review, 1974, 26, 1245-1270. Also reprinted in H. Bedau and C. Pierce (eds.) Capital Punishment in the United States. New York, AMS Press, 1976. Also in H. Bedau (Ed.) The Death Penalty in America (3rd edition) New York: Oxford, 1982.
17. Vidmar, N. Retributive and utilitarian motives and other correlates of Canadian attitudes toward the death penalty. Canadian Psychologist, 1974, 15 337-356.
18. Berg, K. and Vidmar, N. Authoritarianism and recall of evidence about criminal behavior. Journal of Research in Personality, 1975, 9, 147-157. Reprinted in R. Krivoshey (Ed.) Readings in Trial Advocacy and The Social Sciences. Garland Publishing (1993).

19. Sarat, A. and Vidmar, N. Public opinion, the death penalty, and the eighth amendment: testing the Marshall hypothesis. Wisconsin Law Review, 1976, 1976 171-206. Also reprinted in H. Bedau and C. Pierce (eds.) Capital Punishment in the United States. New York: AMS Press, 1976; Victor Streib (ed.) A Capital Punishment Anthology, Springfield, Il. Anderson, 1993.
20. Vidmar, N. Choosing, finding and evaluating methods of obtaining legal justice: a review of Thibaut and Walker's Procedural Justice Contemporary Psychology, 1976, 21, 773-774.
21. Vidmar, N. Social science and jury selection. Law Society of Upper Canada, Psychology and the Litigation Process, 1977.
22. Vidmar, N. The other issues in jury simulation research: A commentary with particular reference to defendant character studies. Law and Human Behavior, 1979, 3, 95-106.
23. Vidmar, N. and Miller, D. T. Social psychological processes underlying attitudes toward legal punishment. Law and Society Review, 1980, 14, 401-438.
24. Miller, D. T. and Vidmar, N. The social psychology of punishment reactions. In M. Lerner & S. Lerner (Eds.), The Justice Motive in Social Behavior Plenum, 1981.
25. Vidmar, N. Justice motives and other psychological factors in the development and resolution of disputes. In M. Lerner & S. Lerner (Eds.), The Justice Motive in Social Behavior. New York: Plenum, 1981.
26. Sheppard, B. and Vidmar, N. Adversary pretrial procedures and testimonial evidence: Effects of lawyers' role and machiavellianism. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1980, 39, 320-332.
27. Vidmar, N. and Judson, J. The use of survey research in a change of venue motion: A case study. Canadian Bar Review, 1981, 59, 76-102.
28. Vidmar, N. and Miller, D. T. Social psychological motives underlying punishment reactions. In H. Hiebsch (Ed.), Social Psychology: XXIIInd International Congress of Psychology. Berlin: VEB Deutscher Verlag, 1982, pp. 195-202.
29. Vidmar, N. Observations on dispute dynamics and resolution hearing outcomes in a small claims court. In S. Lloyd-Bostock (Ed.), Law & Psychology: Oxford University Centre for Socio-legal Studies Proceedings. December 1980.
30. Vidmar, N. and Dittenhoffer, A. Canadian public opinion and the death penalty: The effects of knowledge on attitudes. Canadian Journal of Criminology, 1981, 23, 43-56.
31. Hans, V. and Vidmar, N. Jury selection. In N. Kerr & R. Bray (Eds.), The Psychology of the Courtroom. Academic Press, 1981, pp. 39-82.
32. Saunders, D., Vidmar, N., and Hewitt, E. Eyewitness testimony and the discrediting effect. In S. Lloyd-Bostock & B. Clifford (Eds.), Evaluating Witness Evidence. London: Wiley, 1982.
33. Vidmar, N. and Laird, N. Adversary social roles: Their effects on witnesses' communication of evidence and the assessments of adjudicators. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1983, 44, 888-898.

34. Vidmar, N. and Short, J. Social psychological dynamics in the settlement of small claims court cases. In D. Muller, D. Blackman, & A. Chapman (Eds.), Perspectives in Psychology and Law. London: Wiley, 1984.
35. Vidmar, N. Social psychology and the legal process. In Kahn, A. S. (Ed.), Social psychology. Dubuque, Iowa: W. C. Brown & Co., 1984.
36. Vidmar, N. The small claims court: A reconceptualization of disputes and an empirical investigation. Law & Society Review, 1984, 18, 515-550.
37. Vidmar, N., and Melnitzer, J. Juror prejudice: An empirical study of a challenge for cause. Osgoode Hall Law Journal, 1984, 22, 487-511.
38. Vidmar, N., and Flaherty, D. (1985). Concern for personal privacy in an electronic age. Journal of Communication, 35, 91-103.
39. Vidmar, N. (1985). An assessment of mediation in a small claims court. Journal of Social Issues, 41, 127-144. Also in Earn, B., & Towson, S. (Eds.), Readings in social psychology: Classic and Canadian contributions. Peterborough, Canada: Broadview Press Ltd.
40. Vidmar, N. (1986). The mediation of small claims disputes: A critical perspective. In M. Bazerman, R. Lewicki, & B. Sheppard (Eds.), Research on negotiation in organizations. Vol. 1. JAI Press.
41. Vidmar, N. (1986). The Legal System as Social: A review of Lempert and Sanders' "An Invitation to Law and Social Science". Science, 234, 93-94.
42. Samuels, J., and Vidmar, N. (1987). Consumer complaints and the Ontario Business Practices Act: An empirical study. University of Western Ontario Law Review, 24, 83-101.
43. Vidmar, N. (1987). Assessing the contributions of case characteristics and settlement forums on dispute outcomes and compliance. Law & Society Review, 21, 155-164.
44. Vidmar, N., and Schuller, R. A. (1987). Individual differences and the pursuit of legal rights: A preliminary inquiry. Law and Human Behavior, 11, 299-317.
45. Vidmar, N. (1989). "The impact of statistical evidence in the legal system" in The Evolving Role of Statistical Assessments as Evidence in the Courts. National Research Council, Commission on Behavioral and Social Science and Education: Springer-Verlag.
46. Vidmar, N. (1988). Seeking and finding justice: An empirical map of Canadian consumer problems and responses. Osgoode Hall Law Journal, 26, 757-798.
47. Rowe, T. with Vidmar, N. (1988). Empirical Research on Offers of settlement: A Preliminary Report. Law and Contemporary Problems, 51, 13-39.
48. Vidmar, N. (Editor/author) (1989). Is The Jury Competent? Law and Contemporary Problems, 52, Whole Issue, No. 4.
49. Vidmar, N. and Shuller, R. (1989). Juries and Expert Evidence: Social Framework Testimony. Law and Contemporary Problems, 52, 133-176.
50. Vidmar, N. and Feldthusen, B. (1990). Exemplary Damages in Ontario: An Empirical Study. Canadian Business Law Review, 16, 262-268.

51. Bogart, W.A. and Vidmar, N., (1990). Problems and Experience with the Ontario Civil Justice System. In A. Hutchinson (Ed.) Access To Justice: Bridges and Barriers, Carswell.
52. Vidmar, N., (1990). The Origins and Consequences of Procedural Fairness (Book Review and Essay) Law and Social Inquiry. 15 877-892.
53. Vidmar, N. Social Science Evidence and Data, (1991). In G. M. Chayko, E. D. Gulliver and D. V. MacDougall (Eds.), Forensic Evidence in Canada, Canada Law Book.
54. Vidmar, N. and van Koppen, P. J., (1991). Gedragwetenschappelijk bewijs: een overzicht in P. J. van Koppen & H. F. M. Crombag (eds) De Menselijke Factor: Psychologie voor Juristen: Arnhem: Gouda Quint BV.
55. Vidmar, N. and Rice, J., (1991). Jury determined settlements and summary jury trials: Observations about ADR in an adversary culture, 19 Florida State Law Review 89.
56. Hans, V. and Vidmar, N. (1991), The American Jury: Twenty-five Years Later. 16 Law and Social Inquiry, 401.
57. Vidmar, N. (1991), Medical Malpractice Juries, 8 Duke Law Magazine 8.
58. Kritzer, H., Bogart, W.A., & Vidmar, N. (1991) The Aftermath of Injury: Cultural Factors in Compensation Seeking in Canada and the United States. 25 Law and Society Review 499.
59. Kritzer, H., Vidmar, N. & Bogart, W.A. (1991) To Confront or Not to Confront: Measuring Claiming Rates in Discrimination Grievances 25 Law and Society Review 875.
60. Schuller, R. and Vidmar, N. (1992) Battered Woman Syndrome Evidence in the Courtroom: A Review of the Literature 16 Law and Human Behavior (273).
61. Vidmar, N. (1992) Procedural Justice and Alternative Dispute Resolution 3 Psychological Science (224).
62. Vidmar, N. (1992) The unfair criticism of medical malpractice juries 76 Judicature (118). (Reprinted in 27 Trial Lawyers Forum 5 (1993); 42 Trial Talk 5 (1993); 23 Trial Lawyers Quarterly 9 (1993)).
63. Ellis, Ravindra, Vidmar, and Davis (1993). Toyota's Arbitration Board: A Conflict Resolution Model for Intra-Corporate Disputes 11 Alternatives (44).
64. Vidmar, N. (1993) Verfahrensgerechtigkeit und Alternative Konfliktbewältigung, 14 Zeitschrift für Rechts-Soziologie 35-46.
65. Vidmar, N. and Rice, J. (1993) Assessments of non-economic damage awards in medical negligence: a comparison of jurors with legal professionals 78 Iowa Law Review 883.
66. Fischer, Vidmar and Ellis (1993) The "Culture of Battering" and the Role of Mediation in Domestic Violence Cases 46 Southern Methodist Univ. Law Review 2117-2174 (1993).
67. Vidmar, N. (1993) Empirical Evidence on the "Deep Pockets" Hypothesis: Jury Awards for Pain and Suffering in Medical Malpractice Cases 43 Duke Law Journal 217.
68. Vidmar, N. Comparative Lessons from the Hong Kong Jury Study, 2 Asia Pacific Law Review 110 (1993) (Book Review).

69. Vidmar, N., How Many Words for a Camel? A Perspective on Judicial Evaluation of Social Science Evidence, in Canadian Institute for the Administration of Justice (ed), Filtering and Analyzing Evidence in an Age of Diversity (1993).
70. Vidmar, Lee, Cohen, & Stewart, Damage Awards and Jurors' Responsibility Ascriptions in Medical Versus Automobile Negligence Cases 12 BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES AND THE LAW 149 (1994).
71. Ellis, R., Ravindra, G., Vidmar, N., and Davis, T., The Reversal Arbitration Board: An ADR Model for Resolving Intra-Corporate Disputes, 1994 JOURNAL OF DISPUTE RESOLUTION 93 (1994).
72. Vidmar, N., Are Juries Competent to Decide Liability in Tort Cases Involving Scientific/Medical Issues? Some Data from Medical Malpractice, 43 EMORY LAW JOURNAL 885 (1994).
73. Vidmar, N., An Antidote To Anecdotes (Book review of Frank A. Sloan, et al., Suing for Medical Malpractice, 1993) 77 JUDICATURE 330 (1994).
74. Ogloff, James R. P. and Vidmar, N., The Impact of Pretrial Publicity on Jurors: A Study to Compare the Relative Effects of Television and Print Media in a Child Sex Abuse Case, 18 LAW AND HUMAN BEHAVIOR 507 (1994).
75. Vidmar, N., Making Inferences About Jury Behavior from Jury Verdict Statistics: Cautions About The Lorelei's Lied, 18 LAW AND HUMAN BEHAVIOR 599 (1994).
76. Vidmar, N., Pretrial Prejudice in Canada: A Comparative Perspective on the Criminal Jury, 79 JUDICATURE 249 (1996).
77. Vidmar, N. Pap and Circumstance: What Jury Verdict Statistics Can Tell Us about Jury Behavior and the Tort System. XXVII Suffolk University Law Review 1205 (1994/1996).
78. Vidmar, N. Generic Prejudice and the Presumption of Guilt in Sex Abuse Trials. 21 LAW AND HUMAN BEHAVIOR 5 (Feb 1997).
79. Vidmar, N., Beale, S., Rose, M. & Donnelly, L. Should We Rush to Reform the Criminal Jury? Consider Conviction Rate Data. 80 JUDICATURE 286-290 (May-June 1997).
- Vidmar, N. The Performance of the American Civil Jury: An Empirical Perspective. 40 ARIZONA LAW REVIEW 849 (1998).
- Vidmar, N., Gross, F., & Rose, M. Jury Awards for Medical Malpractice and Post-verdict Adjustment of Those Awards. 48 DEPAUL LAW REVIEW 265 (1998). [Partially reprinted in S Salvin et. Al Civil Procedure: Doctrine, Practice, and Context, 2nd ed. Aspen, 2004].
- Vidmar, N. Maps, Gaps, Socio-legal Scholarship and the Tort Reform Debate In Sarat, A. et al. (eds.) SOCIAL SCIENCE, LEGAL SCHOLARSHIP AND THE LAW, New York: Russell Sage Foundation (1999).
83. Vidmar, principal author, *amicus* brief on behalf of respondent in *Kumho Tire Company v. Patrick Carmichael et. al.* No.97-109 Supreme Court of the United States, October 1998 term (on the subject of how juries evaluate expert testimony).
84. Vidmar, Retribution and Revenge. In J. Sanders and V. L. Hamilton, eds., HANDBOOK OF JUSTICE RESEARCH IN LAW (2001).

85. Vidmar and Schuller, The Jury: Selecting Impartial Peers. In R. Schuller and J. Ogloff, eds. *PSYCHOLOGY AND LAW: CANADIAN PERSPECTIVES* (University of Toronto Press, 2001).
86. Vidmar, ed. *The Common Law Jury* 62 *LAW & CONTEMPORARY PROBLEMS* (1988)
87. Vidmar, Juries don't make legal decisions! And other problems: A critique of Hastie et al. on punitive damages, 23 *LAW & HUMAN BEHAVIOR* 705 (1999).
88. Ruth M. Corbin and Neil Vidmar, Survey Research Goes to Court, in Chuck Chakrapani (ed.) *MARKETING RESEARCH: STATE OF THE ART PERSPECTIVES*. Chicago, IL :American Marketing Association, 2000.
89. Vidmar, The Origin and Outcome of the Kumho Amicus Brief (plus brief itself), *LAW AND HUMAN BEHAVIOR*, 24, 383-400 (2000).
90. Vidmar, Juries in Herbert Kritzer, ed., *LEGAL SYSTEMS OF THE WORLD: A POLITICAL, SOCIAL, AND CULTURAL ENCYCLOPEDIA*, Santa Barbara ,CA: ABC-CLIO (2002)
91. Vidmar, Jury's Comprehension of Scientific Evidence, in U.S. Dept of Justice and National Institute of Justice, *NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON SCIENCE AND THE LAW NCJ 179630* (July, 2000)
92. Vidmar and Diamond, Juries and Experts, *BROOKLYN LAW REVIEW*, 66, 1123-1182 (2001)
93. Diamond and Vidmar, Jury Room Ruminations on Forbidden Evidence, 87 *VIRGINIA LAW REVIEW* 1857 (2001).
94. Vidmar and Rose, Punitive Damages; In *Terrorem* and in Reality, , 38 *HARVARD JOURNAL ON LEGISLATION*, 489-511(2001).
95. Vidmar, Retributive Justice: Its Social Context, in M. Ross and D.T. Miller, eds., *THE JUSTICE MOTIVE IN EVERYDAY LIFE*, 291 (Cambridge U Press, 2001).
96. Vidmar, Review of Jury Systems Abroad Can Provide Helpful Insights Into American Practices, 73 *NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION JOURNAL* 23 (2001).
97. Saks and Vidmar, A Flawed Search for Bias in the American Bar Association's Ratings of Judicial Nominees: A Critique of the Lindgren / Federalist Society Study, *JOURNAL OF LAW AND POLITICS*, 17, No. 2, 219-254 (2001).
98. Vidmar Case Studies of Pre-and Midtrial Prejudice in Criminal and Civil Litigation, *LAW AND HUMAN BEHAVIOR*, 26, 73 (2002). < <http://www.law.duke.edu/pub/vidmar/pretrialPublicity.pdf>>
99. Diamond and Vidmar and others , *JUROR DISCUSSION DURING CIVIL TRIALS: A STUDY OF ARIZONA'S RULE 39(F) INNOVATION*, AMERICAN BAR FOUNDATION, April, 2002 available at: <http://www.law.duke.edu/pub/vidmar/Arizonacivildiscussions.pdf>
100. Sanders, Diamond and Vidmar, Legal Perceptions of Science and Expert Knowledge, *PSYCHOLOGY, PUBLIC POLICY AND LAW* , 8,139(2002).

101. Vidmar, Juries and Lay Assessors in the Commonwealth of Nations, 13 CRIMINAL LAW FORUM 385 (2002).
102. Rose and Vidmar, Bronx "Bronx Juries": A Profile of Jury awards In New York Counties. TEXAS LAW REVIEW, 80, 1889 (2002).
103. Vidmar, Listening to Jurors and Asking Them Questions, TRIAL BRIEFS , August 2002, page 9).
104. Vidmar, The American Civil Jury for Auslander (Foreigners), 13 DUKE JOURNAL OF COMPARATIVE AND INTERNATIONAL LAW 92 (2003), Special Issue in honor of Herbert Bernstein.
105. Diamond, Vidmar, Rose, Ellis and Murphy, Juror Discussions During Trials: Studying an Arizona Innovation, 45 ARIZONA LAW REVIEW 1 (2003).
106. Saks and Vidmar, Asserted but Unproven: A Further Response to the Lindgren Study's Claim that the American Bar Association's Ratings of Judicial Nominees Are Biased, 19 JOURNAL OF LAW AND POLITICS 177 (2003).
107. Eisenberg and Vidmar (drafters), Brief Amici Curiae of Certain Leading Social Scientists and Scholars in Support of Respondents in *State Farm Mutual Automobile Company v. Campbell*, Supreme Court of the United States , No. 01-1289 (October 2002).
108. Vidmar, When All of Us Are Victims: Juror Prejudice and "Terrorist" Trials, 78 CHICAGO-KENT LAW REVIEW 1143 (2003).
109. Diamond, Vidmar, Rose, Ellis and Murphy, Inside the Jury Room: Evaluating Juror Discussions During Trial 87 JUDICATURE 54 (SEPTEMBER-OCTOBER 2003).
110. Vidmar, N. and Brown, Leigh Ann, Tort Reform and the Medical Liability Insurance Crisis in Mississippi: Diagnosing the Disease and Prescribing a Remedy 22 MISSISSIPPI COLLEGE LAW REVIEW 9-46 (2002).
111. Hans, V. and Vidmar, N. Jurors and Juries, in A. Sarat, Ed., THE BLACKWELL COMPANION TO LAW AND SOCIETY (195-211). Malden, MA: Blackwell, (2004).
112. Vidmar, Experimental Simulations and Tort Reform: Avoidance, Error and Overreaching in Sunstein et al.s Punitive Damages 53 EMORY LAW JOURNAL 1359(2004).
113. Vidmar, (Book Review) First, Do No Harm: The Cure for Medical Malpractice, 352 THE NEW ENGLAND JOURNAL OF MEDICINE 521 (2/3/2005).
114. Vidmar, Lee, MacKillop , McCarthy and McGwinn, Uncovering the "Invisible " Profile of Medical Malpractice Litigation: Insights from Florida, 54 DEPAUL LAW REVIEW 315 (2005).
115. Vidmar, Medical Malpractice Lawsuits: An Essay on Patient Interests, the Contingency Fee System, Juries and Social Policy, LOYOLA LOS ANGELES LAW REVIEW (2005).
116. Vidmar, Juries Around the Globe, ABA INSIGHTS (in press)

C. Papers and Conferences:

1. McGrath, J. E. and Vidmar, N. Role assignment and conflict in decisionmaking groups: partial test of a model of negotiation. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Convention, Chicago, May 1966.
2. Vidmar, N. and McGrath, J. E. Role conflict and leadership in negotiation and other decisionmaking groups. Paper presented at Midwestern Psychological Association Convention, Chicago, May 1967.
3. Vidmar, N. and Hackman, J. R. Effects of group size, task type and subject population on group satisfaction. Paper presented at the Canadian Psychological Association Convention, Calgary, Alberta, June 1968.
4. Vidmar, N. Group composition and risk taking. Paper presented at the Eastern Psychological Association Convention, April, 1968.
5. Ferguson, D. A. and Vidmar, N. Effects of group discussion on estimates of culturally appropriate risk levels. Paper presented at the Eastern Psychological Association Convention, Atlanta City, New Jersey, April 1970.
6. Ferguson, D. A. and Vidmar, N. Familiarization-induced risky and cautious shifts: a replication of sorts. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association Convention, Cincinnati, Ohio, May 1970.
7. Vidmar, N. and Burdeny, T. C. Effects of item type and group size in the "group shift" effect. Paper presented at the Mid-western Psychological Association Convention, Cincinnati, Ohio, May 1970.
8. Crinklaw, L. D. and Vidmar, N. Attributing responsibility for an accident: More empirical confusion but methodological insights. Mid-Western Psychological Association Convention, Detroit, Michigan, May 1971.
9. Hourany, L., Jackson, D. and Vidmar, N. A four-dimensional interpretation of risk taking. Mid-Western Psychological Association Convention, Detroit, Michigan, May 1971.
10. Vidmar, N., Effects of decision alternatives on the verdicts and social perceptions of simulated jurors. Eastern Psychological Association Convention, New York, April 1972.
11. Vidmar, N., Student reactions to the 1970 Canadian political crisis. Symposium Paper, Canadian Psychological Association Convention, St. John's Newfoundland, June 1971.
12. Vidmar, N. and Crinklaw, L. D. Attributing responsibility for an accident: some integrative attempts. Conference on Attribution of Responsibility, William and Mary College, Williamsburg, Virginia, July 1971.
13. Vidmar, N., Effects of group discussion on category width judgments. Eastern Psychological Convention, Boston, April 1972.
14. Vidmar, N., Group induced shifts in simulated jury decisions. MidWestern Psychological Association, Cleveland, Ohio, 1970.
15. Vidmar, N. and Rokeach, M. Archie Bunker's bigotry: perceptions in the eye of the beholder. Eastern Psychological Association Convention, Washington, D.C., May 3-5, 1973.

16. Vidmar, N. and Crinklaw, L. D. Retribution and utility as motives in sanctioning behavior. Mid-Western Psychological Association Convention, Chicago, May 10-12, 1973.
17. Vidmar, N. Retribution and utility as motives in Canadian attitudes toward the death penalty. Canadian Psychological Association Convention, Victoria, B.C., June 10, 1973.
18. Stirrett, K. and Vidmar, N. Authoritarianism and recall of evidence in formal sanctioning settings. Eastern Psychological Association Convention, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, April 18, 1974.
19. Sarat, A. and Vidmar, N. Knowledge, retribution, and death penalty attitudes: a survey experiment. Eastern Psychological Association, New York, April 22-24, 1976.
20. Vidmar, N. Effects of degree of harm and retribution motives on punishment reactions. Canadian Psychological Association, Vancouver, B.C., June 8, 1977.
21. Vidmar, N. Outcome, offense type, and retribution as factors in punishment reactions. Eastern Psychological Association, Washington, D.C., April 30, 1978.
22. Vidmar, N. Symposium: The role of psychology in the criminal justice system (Chair). Law and Society Association, Minneapolis, Minnesota, May 18, 1978.
23. Vidmar, N. Effects of adversary versus nonadversary investigative procedures on testimonial evidence. Law and Society Association, Minneapolis, Minnesota, May 19, 1978.
24. Vidmar, N. Creating access: Alternative dispute forums, conflict, and justice. Symposium entitled "How the law affects us: Entrapping problems and liberating possibilities" (M. Lerner, Chair). American Psychological Association, Toronto, August 28, 1978.
25. Vidmar, N. The transformation of disputes in a small claims court. Law and Society Association, May 11, 1979.
26. Vidmar, N. Social psychological considerations in the development and resolution of small claims disputes. SSRC Law and Psychology Seminar. Oxford University, England, March 25-26, 1980.
27. Vidmar, N. and Miller, D. T. Socialpsychological motives underlying punishment reactions. XXII International Congress of Psychology, Leipzig, East Germany, July 9, 1980.
28. Vidmar, N. Legal applications of survey research in the U.S. and Canada. Law Seminar. University of Osnabruck, West Germany, July 11, 1980.
29. Sheppard, B., and Vidmar, N. A taxonomy of procedure. Presented at the Annual Law and Psychology Conference, Centre for Socio-legal studies, Oxford University, Oxford, England, April 1981.
30. Saunders, D., and Vidmar, N. Discredited eyewitness testimony and mock jury deliberations. Presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association, Detroit, May 1981.
31. Saunders, D., Hewitt, E., and Vidmar, N. Discredited eyewitness testimony, judicial instructions, and juror decisions. Presented at the Canadian Psychological Association, Toronto, June 1981.
32. Sheppard, B., and Vidmar, N. Comparative procedure: A psychological perspective. Presented at the Law and Society Association Meetings, Amherst, Mass., June 1981.

33. Vidmar, N. A limited defense of simulation research. Presented as part of a symposium at the American Psychology-Law Association Meetings, Boston, October 16, 1981.
34. Vidmar, N. Jury selection in Canada. Presented at the American Psychology-Law Association Meetings, Boston, October 15, 1981.
35. Vidmar, N. and Short, J. Social psychological aspects of the small claims resolution. Presented at the International Conference on Psychology and Law, Swansea, Wales, July 1982.
36. Vidmar, N. Dispute resolution in a small claims court. Presented at the Law and Society Association, Toronto, June 1982.
37. Vidmar, N. A research perspective on evaluation of community mediation. Presented at the Institute of Public Affairs, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia, June 10, 1982.
38. Vidmar, N. Alternatives to judges: Referees in a small claims court. Symposium Presentation at the Canadian Psychological Association, Montreal, June 11, 1982.
39. Vidmar, N., and Short, J. Changes in disputant motives and perceptions in a Canadian small claims court. Presented at the International Congress on Psychology and Law, Swansea, Wales, July 19-23, 1982.
40. Vidmar, N. Jury selection: Two Canadian cases. Presented to the Department of Psychology, University of Guelph, January 1983.
41. Vidmar, N. Jury selection: Two Canadian cases. Presented to the Institute for Criminology, University of Toronto, February 1, 1983.
42. Vidmar, N. Jury selection: Two Canadian cases. Presented to the Department of Psychology, University of Windsor, March 1983.
43. Vidmar, N. Consumers avoid it; defendants lose--and other myths about the small claims court. Presented at the Law and Society Association Meetings, Denver, Colorado, June 2-5, 1983.
44. Vidmar, N. Recent developments in our understanding of the disputing process. Presented to Psychology-Law Research Center, St. Louis University, June 1983.
45. Vidmar, N. Myth and reality about "everyman's court": An empirical investigation of the small claims process. Invited address presented to the American Psychology-Law Society, Chicago, Illinois, October 6, 1983.
46. Vidmar, N. The expert witness in court. Presented at the Symposium on the Expert Witness, London Psychiatric Hospital, London, Ontario, November 1983.
47. Vidmar, N. Some myths about the small claims court. Presented to the Department of Psychology, York University, April 1984.
48. Saunders, D., and Vidmar, N. Liability insurance, judicial admonitions, and the verdicts of mock juries. Presented at the Canadian Psychological Association Meeting, Ottawa, June 1, 1984.
49. Vidmar, N. Assessing household problems, claims and disputes: A Canadian survey. Presented at the Law and Society Association Meetings, Boston, June 1984.

50. Vidmar, N. Dispute resolution in a small claims court. Presented at The University of Waterloo, November 1984.
51. Vidmar, N. Mediation of small claims disputes. Presented at the Conference on Negotiation in Organizations, Duke University, March 21, 1985.
52. Vidmar, N. An empirical map of minor dispute behavior in Canada. Presented to the Canadian Law and Society Association, Montreal, May 31, 1985.
53. Samuels, J., and Vidmar, N. Unfair trade practices legislation: A study of impact. Presented to the Canadian Law and Society Association, Montreal, May 31, 1985.
54. Vidmar, N. Future directions of procedural justice research. Invited discussant on Procedural Justice Symposium, Law and Society Association, San Diego, California, June 6, 1985.
55. Vidmar, N., and Samuels, J. Unfair trade practices legislation: A study of compliance, administrative response, and impact. Law and Society Association, San Diego, California, June 6, 1985.
56. Vidmar, N. Jury Experts: A Critical Perspective. Association of American Law Schools. New Orleans, La. January 6, 1986.
57. Vidmar, N. Claims Consciousness: Individual Differences in the Pursuit of Justice. Law and Society Association Meetings, Chicago, May 28 - June 1, 1986.
58. Vidmar, N. A critique of "scientific jury selection". Litigation Section of the American Bar Association, October 1986.
59. Vidmar, N. Social science and juries in Canada. Canadian Criminal Lawyers' Association, Toronto, November 1986.
60. Vidmar, N. Understanding dispute resolution: An empirical approach to problems of law. Theoria Seminar of Windsor Law School, April 1987.
61. Vidmar, N. Conceptualizing the data problem in medical malpractice cases. Conference in Developing Information Bases for Medical Malpractice Claims Studies, Duke University, N.C., May 29, 1987.
62. Vidmar, N. On libel and civil juries. Law and Society Association Meetings, June 10-14, 1987.
63. Vidmar, N., and Schuller, R. Individual differences and the pursuit of legal rights: A preliminary inquiry. Law and Society Association Meetings, Washington, D.C., June 11, 1987.
64. Schuller, R. and Vidmar, N. Determinants of Procedural Choice. Annual meeting of the Canadian Psychological Association, Vancouver June 18-21 (1987).
65. Conference Consultant: Legal Education and Work in a Changing Society. University of Windsor Law School. September 9, 1987.
66. Vidmar, N. Jury Decision-making, Invited Speaker, Cleveland-Marshall College of Law, Cleveland, November 2, 1987.
67. Bogart, W.A. and Vidmar, N. Problems and Experience with the Ontario Civil Justice System. Ontario Ministry of the Attorney General, Conference on Access to Justice, Toronto, June 20-22, 1988.

68. Vidmar, N. and Bogart, W. A., Access to Justice in Canada. Presented at Institute for Legal Studies, University of Wisconsin, December 2, 1988.
69. Vidmar, N., Can They Prosper in Law School? in Social Science and Law Section, Panel on Can Social Scientists Survive in Law School?, Association of American Law Schools, New Orleans, LA., January 7-9, 1989.
70. Vidmar, N., Integrating Social Science, Osgoode Hall Law School Conference: Transforming the Law School Curriculum. Toronto, April 6, 1989.
71. Vidmar, N., An Empirical Perspective on Procedure in Medical Malpractice Cases, Kellogg Center for Dispute Resolution and Program on Social Science and Law, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. May 5, 1989.
72. Metzloff, T. and Vidmar, N., The Dynamics of Litigation Settlement in Medical Malpractice. Annual Law and Society Meeting, Madison, Wisc. June 9, 1989.
73. Vidmar, N., Claim Making and Outcomes in Ontario. Annual Law and Society Meeting, Madison, Wisc. June 9, 1989.
74. Vidmar, N., The Role of the Jury in Medical Malpractice Cases in North Carolina. Conference on Medical Malpractice, Duke University, September 15, 1989.
75. Vidmar, N. and Donnelly, L., Implementation of the North Carolina Pre-Trial Management Statute. Conference on Medical Malpractice, Duke University, September 15, 1989.
76. Vidmar, N., An Empirical Profile of Punitive Damages in Ontario. International Symposium on Remedies, University of Windsor Law School, Windsor, Canada, October, 1989.
77. Vidmar, N., An Update on the Jury. Judicial Administration Program, University of Nevada-Reno, January 18, 1990.
78. Vidmar, N., Juries and Pre-Trial Prejudices. Panelist at Northwestern University Annenberg Washington Conference on Juries and Prejudice, Washington, D.C. May 11, 1990.
79. Vidmar, N., Empirical Research on Juries. Panelist for Ad Hoc Committee of the National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C., May 12, 1990.
80. Bogart, W.A. and Vidmar, N., Independent Paralegals in Ontario. Annual Law and Society Meetings, Berkeley, California, June, 1990.
81. Kritzer, H., Bogart, W.A., and Vidmar, N. The Aftermath of Injury: Compensation Seeking in Canada and the United States. Annual Law and Society Association Meeting, Berkeley, California. June, 1990.
82. Vidmar, N. Panelist: The Use of Psychology in the Teaching of Trial Advocacy. ABA Conference on Trial Advocacy Training in the '90s, Chicago, Illinois. October 26-27, 1990.
83. Kritzer, H., Vidmar, N. and Bogart, W.A., The genesis of discrimination litigation: Comparing Canada and the United States. Presented at Southern Political Science Association, November 8-10, 1990, Atlanta, Georgia.

84. Kritzer, H., Vidmar, N., Bogart, W. and Zahorik, K., Legal Mobilization in Canada and the United States: Consumer Problems in North America. Presented at the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, Ill. April 18-20, 1991.
85. Rice, J. A. and Vidmar, N., "Assessing Non-economic Damages: Lawyers versus Laypersons. Paper presented at the Annual Law and Society Meetings, Amsterdam, The Netherlands. June 26-29, 1991.
86. Kritzer, A., Vidmar, N. and Bogart, W., Context, Context, Context: Claiming Behavior in Two Countries. Paper presented at the Annual Law and Society Meetings, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, June 26-29, 1991.
87. Vidmar, N., Participant, Conference on Civil Discovery: Towards a Research Agenda for the 1990's and Beyond. Sponsored by The Federal Judicial Center. Washington, D.C., September 20, 1991.
88. Ogloff, J.R. P., Vidmar, N. and Green, J.D., The impact of pretrial publicity on jurors: a study to compare the relative effect of print and video pretrial publicity. Presented at the American Psychology-Law Society Biennial Meeting, San Diego, CA., March, 1992.
89. Vidmar, N., Medical malpractice litigation: Jury awards for non-economic damages. Presented at the American Psychology-Law Society Biennial Meeting, San Diego, CA., March, 1992.
90. Vidmar, N., Faculty Member, Second Annual Conference on Resolving Commercial Disputes Without Trial. (Sponsored by School of Law, U. of Texas at Austin) Houston, TX., March 28-29, 1992.
91. Vidmar, N., Rice, Jeffrey, and Ellis, Rene, Jury Determined Settlements and Alternative Dispute Resolution. Presented at Law and Society Association Philadelphia, May 29, 1992.
92. Vidmar, N., Participant in Round Table Discussion: Methodological Approaches to Jury Research. Law and Society Association, Philadelphia, May 30, 1992.
93. Vidmar, N., Procedural Justice and Alternative Dispute Resolution. Presented at Conference on Procedural Justice, International Institute for the Sociology of Law, Onati Spain, June 8-11, 1992.
94. Vidmar, N., Bogart, W.A. and Kritzer, H. Complaining and Compensation Seeking in Three Modern Cultures, International Congress of Psychology, Brussels, Belgium, July 20, 1992.
95. Vidmar, N., "Juries and Medical Negligence" Colloquium talk presented to Univ. of North Carolina School of Law, Nov. 12, 1992.
96. Vidmar, N., Participant in Round Table on "The Courtroom and Public Culture" Duke Univ. Dept. of History, Nov. 13-14, 1992.
97. Vidmar, Faculty Presentation: "Juries and Alternative Dispute Resolution in Medical Malpractice." Fourth Annual Risk Management Symposium, East Carolina School of Medicine, Greenville, NC March 17, 1993.
98. Vidmar, Juries and The "Deep Pockets" Hypothesis in Medical Malpractice - Annual Meeting of the Law and Society Association, Chicago, May 26-30, 1993.
99. Fischer, Vidmar, & Ellis, The Culture of Battering and the Role of Mediation in Domestic Violence Cases, Annual Meeting of the Law and Society Association, Chicago, May 26-30, 1993.

100. Vidmar, Participant: Conference sponsored by NSF and Rand Corporation: Broadening the Tort Liability Debate: Toward a Research Agenda. Santa Monica, CA, October 10-12, 1993.
101. Vidmar, "How Many Words for a Camel? A Commentary on Judicial Evaluation of Social Science Evidence," at Canadian Institute for the Administration of Justice Conference: Filtering and Analyzing Evidence in an Age of Diversity. Vancouver, Canada, October 13-16, 1993.
102. Vidmar, Panel Participant: Criminal Lawyers Associations Conference: Human Memory and Sex Abuse Cases: The Misuse and Abuse of Science. Toronto, Canada, Nov. 5-7, 1993.
103. Vidmar, Panel Participant: The Impact of Science and Technology on The Courts. Emory University Law School February 24, 1994.
104. Vidmar, Symposium Organizer and Presenter: Are They Competent? New Research on Major Issues Involving Contemporary Criminal and Civil Juries. American Psychology and Law Association, Santa Fe, New Mexico. March 10-12, 1994.
105. Vidmar, Panelist: Criminal Lawyers Association (Ontario): Cross-examining the Sex Abuse Expert. Toronto, Ontario, April 9, 1994.
106. Vidmar, "Judging Psychological Predictions", Lecture to National Judicial Institute (Canada): Intensive Study Program. Cornwall, Ontario, May 9, 1994.
107. Vidmar & Landau, Paper Presented: How do juries and legal professionals treat corporate and individual defendants? Law & Society Association in Phoenix, Arizona, June 15-19, 1994.
108. Vidmar, Discussant on Panel on Gender, Voice and Legal Consciousness: Law & Society Assoc., Phoenix Ariz., June 15-19, 1994.
109. Vidmar, Colloquium. Medical Malpractice Juries and the Tort Reform Debate. Department of Psychology and the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University, September 16, 1994.
110. Vidmar, Discussant, Symposium: "Law, State and Society in India", North Carolina State University, October 29, 30, 1994, Raleigh, NC.
111. Vidmar, Panelist, Jury Selection in the Post-*Parks* era. Criminal Lawyers Association (Ontario, Canada), Toronto, Canada, Nov. 11-13, 1994.
112. Vidmar, Colloquium: Medical Malpractice and The American Jury. DePaul University School of Law, March 15, 1995.
113. Vidmar, Testimony: On the "Common Product and Legal Reform Act of 1995" at a hearing on "The Costs of the Legal System" held by the Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight and the Courts of the Committee of the Judiciary of the United States Senate, Washington, D.C. May 2, 1995.
114. Vidmar, Faculty Presentation: Judging Psychological Predictions. The Intensive Study Program, 1995 of the National Judicial Institute, Cornwall, Ontario, Canada, May 9, 1995.
115. Vidmar, Presentation: Six versus Twelve and All versus Some: Considerations in Changes to The Jury System. Commission for the Future of Justice and the Courts in North Carolina, Pinehurst, N.C., September 14, 1995.

116. Vidmar, N., Participant. Planning Conference on Scientific Experts, Duke University, Private Adjudication Center, Sept. 15-16, 1995.
117. Vidmar, "Medical Malpractice Litigation," Conference on Consumers in the Civil Justice System, Suffolk University Law School, Boston, MA. October 20, 1995.
118. Vidmar, "Empirical Research on Juries: A Very Critical Perspective." Conference on "The Role of the Jury in a Democratic Society", Georgetown University Law Center, Washington, DC October 28, 1995.
119. Vidmar, Participant, Forum: Juries, Justice and the Media - After O. J., Annenberg Washington Program, Washington, D.C., January 23, 1996.
120. Vidmar, Presenter: Symposium on Empirical Research on the Tort System at National Press Club; at U.S. Capitol (briefing of legislative aids) March 12, 1996.
121. Vidmar, Moderator/Participant: Planning meeting on terrorism, hate crime, and anti-governmental violence. Committee on Law and Justice: National Academy of Sciences and National Research Council, Washington, D.C., March 20, 1996.
122. Vidmar, "Survey Evidence", presented at conference on Judging Science, Texas Center for the State Judiciary, Dallas, Texas, May 16, 1996.
123. Vidmar, "Survey Evidence" at Judging Science Workshop, Duke Law School, Durham, N.C., May 24, 1996.
124. Vidmar, "Understanding Social Science Evidence" Nova Scotia Judicial Education Seminar of the National Judicial Institute, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada, June 6, 1996.
125. Vidmar, "Generic prejudice and the presumption of guilt in sex abuse trials: some data from Canada". Presented at the Law & Society Association Annual Meetings, Glasgow, Scotland, July 10, 1996.
126. Vidmar, "Claims about medical malpractice in Illinois' tort reform amendments (1995): a reality check." Presented at the Law & Society Association Annual Meeting, Glasgow, Scotland. July 11, 1996.
127. Vidmar, "A comparative perspective on the Canadian criminal jury". Presented at the Law & Society Association Annual Meetings, Glasgow, Scotland, July 13, 1996.
128. Vidmar, "Empirical research on the Jury". Presented at workshop on "Improving Jury Selection and Juror Comprehension" Co-sponsored by the Federal Judicial Center and the NYU Institute of Judicial Administration. NYU School of Law, New York, Dec. 11-13, 1996.
129. Vidmar, "Medical malpractice, frivolous litigation, jury verdicts, and settlement". Presented at Georgetown University Law Center, Washington, D.C., Feb.5, 1997.
130. Vidmar, Response to keynote address and panelist: Cornell J. of Law and Public Policy Symposium " Arbiters or Arbitrary? Redefining the Role of the Jury". Cornell Law School, Ithaca NY March 7-8, 1997.

131. Vidmar, " Gaps, Maps,Socio-legal Scholarship and the Tort Reform Debate: Medical Malpractice Litigation". Symposium: "Social Science,Legal Scholarship and the Law: A Symposium in Honor of Stanton Wheeler. Yale Law School, April 11-12, 1997
132. Vidmar, "Retribution, Revenge and Aggression". Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Law & Society Assn. St. Louis , May 29, 1997.
133. Vidmar. "Peremptory Challenges". University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform Symposium, "Jury Reform: Making Juries Work". Ann Arbor Michigan, March 20-21, 1998.
134. Vidmar, Gross and Rose. "Jury Awards in Medical Malpractice: A profile of Awards, Proportions for General Damages, and Post-Verdict Adjustments. Fourth Annual Clifford Symposium on Tort Law and Public Policy, DePaul University College of Law, Chicago., April 3-4, 1998.
135. Vidmar. Workshop Participant Planning Conference :Teaching Judges About Science. National Judicial College, Reno, Nevada. April 7-8, 1998.
136. Vidmar."The Performance of the American Civil Jury: An Empirical Perspective." Paper presented at "Courts on Trial" Conference, University of Arizona College of Law, Tucson, Arizona, April 17- 18, 1998.
137. Vidmar. Discussant. "Lay Participation in Courts." Annual Meetings of the Law & Society Association. Aspen, Colorado, June 4-7, 1998.
138. Vidmar. Discussant. "Research Examining Scientific Evidence: *Daubert* and Beyond." Annual Meetings of the Law & Society Association. Aspen, Colorado, June 4-7, 1998.
139. Vidmar. Pretrial Prejudice: A Comparative Perspective on Common Law Jury Systems. Talk presented to School of Law , University of Nebraska, March 8, 1999.
140. Vidmar. Procedural Justice and Pro Se Claimants in Dalkon Shield Trust Resolution Hearings. Roberta Williams Lecture. Psychology and Law Program, University of Nebraska, March 8, 1999.
141. Vidmar. Expert Evidence and the Jury: An Overview. National Conference on Science and Law (Sponsored by National Institute of Justice and other institutions) San Diego, CA, April 15-16, 1999.
142. Vidmar. The Canadian Jury System: Attempting to Balance Conflicting Goals and Seek Legitimacy in a Complicated World. Conference on "Lay Participation in the Criminal Trial In the 21st Century. International Institute of Higher Studies in Criminal Sciences, Siricusa, Italy, May 26-29, 1999.
143. Vidmar. Witnesses in Adversary versus Inquisitorial modes of criminal procedure. International Conference on Psychology and Law , Dublin, Ireland July 6-9, 1999.
144. Vidmar. Panel Chair: Designating evidence as science, technical or specialized knowledge. International Conference on Psychology and Law , Dublin, Ireland July 6-9, 1999.
82. Vidmar. Civil jury verdicts v. judgments and other post-verdict adjustments. International Conference on Psychology and Law , Dublin, Ireland July 6-9, 1999.

83. Vidmar. Evaluating scientific expert evidence. Invited lecture to Supreme Court of British Columbia Education Seminar, Vancouver, BC Canada , November 5, 1999. [Paper also posted on the Judicial Affairs Information Network (JAIN) and Provincial Judges Net (PJPNet)]
84. Vidmar. The Performance and functioning of juries in medical malpractice cases. ALI and ABA Course: Litigating Medical Malpractice Claims San Francisco, CA Nov 11-13, 1999.
85. Vidmar. Retribution in Law and Life. Colloquium presented to University of California Law School, Los Angeles CA , December 3, 1999.
149. Vidmar, The "Scandalized" American jury. Grant Sawyer Center for Justice Studies, Reno, Nevada, April 20, 2000.
150. Vidmar. Jury systems around the world: a comparative perspective. Grant Sawyer Center for Justice Studies, Reno, Nevada, April 20. 2000.
151. Vidmar and Diamond, Preliminary findings of the Pima County civil jury project, Continuing Legal Education Course, Tucson, AZ, April 24, 2000.
152. Joseph Sanders, Shari Diamond and Neil Vidmar, Trial Lawyers' Perceptions of Science. Law & Society Association, Miami Beach, Florida, May 28, 2000.
153. Mary Rose and Neil Vidmar, Product Liability Awards and Post-Verdict Adjustment of Those Awards. Law & Society Association, Miami Beach, Florida, May 28, 2000.
154. Vidmar, Judging Social Science. Judging Science Program, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina, May 25, 2000.
155. Vidmar, Performance of the American Civil Jury. Bench Bar Conference of the Supreme Court of Delaware. Wilmington, DE. June 7, 2000.
156. Vidmar, Assessing Civil Jury Reforms in Arizona. Annual Conference of Chief Justices of State Supreme Courts and State Supreme Court Administrators. Rapid City, SD, July 31, 2000.
157. Vidmar and Diamond, Juries and Expert Evidence. Conference on "The Jury in the Twenty-first Century: An Interdisciplinary Conference. Brooklyn Law School, October 6, 2000.
158. Vidmar, Problems of Jury Bias, Jury Selection, Jury Competence: A Cross-National Perspective. Auckland, NZ, University of Auckland School of Law and New Zealand Legal Research Foundation (November 7, 2000); Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington, NZ November 21, 2000); New Zealand Ministry of Justice (November 22, 2000).
159. Vidmar, Faculty Member. Lecture on World Jury Systems. Jury Summit 2001 conference sponsored by New York State Unified Court System and National Center for State Courts, New York, NY Jan 31 -Feb 3, 2001.
160. Diamond and Vidmar. Jury Room Ruminations on Missing Evidence. Conference on New Perspectives on Evidence , U. Virginia School of Law, Charlottesville, VA, February 23-24, 2001.
161. Vidmar and Rose. Punitive Damages : *In Terrorum* and In Reality. Conference: Reforming Punitive Damages. Harvard Law School, Cambridge, MA, March 13, 2001.

162. Vidmar, Pre-trial and Mid-trial Prejudice. Keynote address to American Society of Trial Consultants. Williamsburg, VA June 2, 2001.
163. Vidmar, Lay Participation in the Administration of Justice in the Commonwealth of Nations, Paper presented at the Law and Society Association Meetings, Budapest Hungary, July 5, 2001.
164. Vidmar, Juries, Judges and Civil Justice, Roscoe Pound Institute's 2001 Forum for State Court Judges, Montreal, Canada, July 14, 2001.
165. Vidmar, Panelist Symposium on the Criminal Jury, St. Louis University School of Law, February 8, 2002.
166. Vidmar, Panelist and Organizer: The Arizona Jury Project, Presented at the American Psychology and Law Society Bi-Annual Meeting, Austin Texas, March 9, 2002.
167. Vidmar, Panelist and Organizer, Studying Real Juries--The Arizona Civil Jury Videotaping Project, Annual Law and Society Association Meetings, Vancouver, B.C. (May 30-June 1, 2002).
168. Vidmar, organizer, panelist, Jury Trials in Inuit and Other Aboriginal Communities: Conversations with a Canadian Judge, Annual Law and Society Association Meetings, Vancouver, B.C. (May 30-June 1).
169. Vidmar, Panelist, "Something New Under the Sun: Innovations in Civil Jury Trials," Annual Meeting of the American Bar Association, Washington, D.C. August 11, 2002.
170. Vidmar, Presentation on "Medical Malpractice and the Tort System, to Governor's Select Task Force on Healthcare Professional Liability Insurance [Florida], University of Miami Medical Center, November 4, 2002.
171. Vidmar and Brown, Tort Reform and the Medical Malpractice Crisis in Mississippi: Diagnosing the Disease and Prescribing a Remedy. Symposium on Tort Reform, Mississippi College of Law, Jackson, MS, Nov 15, 2002.
172. Testimony before Field Hearing of Energy and Commerce Committee: Oversight and Investigation Subcommittee of U.S. House of representatives: February 10, 2003, Langhorne PA.: Subject: Medical Malpractice Litigation.
173. Vidmar, Expert Evidence, The Adversary System and the Jury. The Coronado Conference on Scientific Evidence and Public Policy, San Diego, CA March 13-14 2003.
174. Vidmar, Medical Malpractice Litigation in North Carolina, Presentation to the North Carolina Senate Select Committee on Insurance and Civil Justice, Raleigh, NC, May 13, 2003.
175. Vidmar, Panelist, (with Steve Penrod) Sources of Variability in the Relations between Pre-trial Publicity and Pre-trial Bias. International Interdisciplinary Conference on Psychology and Law. Edinburgh, Scotland, July 7-12, 2003.
176. Vidmar, Panelist. Application of Jury Research: A Debate on the Selection of Research Questions and Methods. International Interdisciplinary Conference on Psychology and Law. Edinburgh, Scotland, July 7-12, 2003.

177. Vidmar, Participant/ commentator , Conference on Jury Ethics: Juror Conduct and Jury Dynamics. John Jay College of Criminal Justice, New York, September 12 –13,2003.
178. Vidmar, Participant. Research meeting on Implications of *Daubert* in Practice. Sponsored by Tellus Institute. Washington, D.C. November 20, 2003.
179. Vidmar, Testimony on tort reform and medical malpractice, North Carolina House Blue Ribbon Task Force on Medical Malpractice, Raleigh, NC, Jan 7, 2004.
180. Vidmar, Potential Jury Prejudice in Criminal (and Civil) Litigation, Presentation to the 19th Annual Criminal Law Update Seminar of the South Carolina Bar, Charleston , SC, January 23, 2004.
181. Vidmar, Experimental Simulations and Tort Reform: Avoidance, Error and Over-reaching in Sunstein et al.'s Punitive Damages (2002). Presented at the 2004 Randolph W. Thrower Annual Symposium: The Future of Tort Reform: Reforming the Remedy, Re-balancing the Scales, Emory Law School, Atlanta GA, February 19, 2004.
182. Vidmar, Lee and McGwin, "Seeking the "Invisible" Profile of Medical Malpractice Litigation: Insights from Florida. Presentation, Tenth Annual Clifford Symposium: "Starting Over? Redesigning the Medical Malpractice System," DePaul University School of Law, Chicago, IL, April 15-16, 2004.
183. Vidmar, Potential Jury Prejudice: A Cross-National Perspective. Colloquium, School of Psychology, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, May 5,2004.
184. Vidmar, Coffee Spill at McDonalds: The American Civil Jury for Foreigners. Colloquium, Department of Law, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, May 25, 2004.
185. Vidmar, Medical Malpractice Litigation: An Empirical Rather than Anecdotal Perspective, Presentation at the Maryland State Bar Association Annual Meeting, Ocean City , MD, June 17, 2004.
186. Vidmar, Medical Malpractice Litigation: Doctors, Lawyers, Patients and Insurers. Presentation at Conference on Access to Justice: Can Business Co-exist with the Civil Justice System? Loyola, Law School, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, October 1&2, 2004.
187. Vidmar, Participant, Coronado Conference 2, Sequestered Science: The Consequences of Undisclosed Knowledge, Project on Scientific Knowledge and Public Policy, New York, NY, October 14-15, 2004.
188. Vidmar, Medical Malpractice Litigation and Tort Reform: The Tort System and the Missing Discussion of Negligently Injured Patients, Testimony before the Maryland Senate Special Commission on Medical Malpractice Liability Insurance Briefing, Annapolis Maryland, Wednesday, October 27, 2004.
189. Vidmar, Research on Medical Malpractice Litigation in the United States and Tort Reform, Testimony before the Committee on the Judiciary of the Connecticut General Assembly, Hartford CT, April 8, 2005.

D. Selected Technical Research Reports:

1. Vidmar, N. Perceptions of Patient Behavior and Effects of Environmental Change. T.R. #601 Danville, Illinois: Danville Veterans Administration Hospital, August, 1969.

2. McGrath, J. E., Vidmar, N. and Weidemann, S. Social and Psychological Factors in Human Stress. Program Report: Phase I. AFOSR Conference on Human Stress, Monticello, Illinois, April 1967.
3. Crinklaw, L. and Vidmar, N. Attribution of Responsibility for an Accident. U.W.O. Research Bulletin #186, 1971.
4. Crinklaw, L. and Vidmar, N. Inferential Sets, Locus of Control and Attribution of Responsibility for an Accident. U.W.O. Research Bulletin #246, 1972.

5. Vidmar, N. Implementing the information/education campaign on firearms control: A literature review. Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada, April 1978.
6. Vidmar, N. and Short, J. A. (1982) The effects of criminal justice issues on voting behavior. Federal Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada.
7. Vidmar, N. Privacy and Two-way Cable Television: A Study of Canadian Public Opinion. Ontario Ministry of Transportation and Communication, May 1983.
8. Vidmar, N., and Lawrence, C. The impact of statistical evidence on the legal system. Prepared for (U.S.) National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences, April 30, 1985.
9. Kritzer, H., Bogart, W.A., and Vidmar, N. (1990) The Aftermath of Injury: Compensation Seeking in Canada and the United States. Institute of Legal Studies, U. of Wisconsin Law School, Madison, Wisconsin.
10. Vidmar, N., Donnelly, L., Metzloff, T. and Warren, D., (1992) An Empirical Examination of a Legislated Procedural Reform: Court-based Management of Medical Malpractice Litigation. The Private Adjudication Center, Inc., Duke Law School, Durham, N.C.

Appendix B: Edited Responses of Selected Jurors

Juror #	40	42	44	45	48	49	81	82
1			x	x				
3	Yes. About Sami Al-Arian and how he funded terrorism	Yes. Newspaper and News. A) That he is somehow involved.	x Yes, A) About how she handled or didn't handle the situation. C) I feel he is somehow involved. D) Yes	Yes. A) his involvement with the university and links to terrorism. B) & c) He's somehow involved D) Yes	Yes	Guilty. Everything that I have read, and who he is associated with.	Yes	No. I believe he is somehow involved
4	Just that he was accused of giving info to terrorists	There' guilty			Yes	Guilty What's there from 911 and personal experience	yes	Yes. I think there guilty
8	Yes. Sami Al Arian was using school to set up terrorist cell to use against USA.	No.	Yes. Beth Castor allowed Al-Arian to continue on campus which cost her the election. C) Guilty D) Yes	No c) Terrorist / Guilty d) absolutely	Yes	Guilty	Yes	No. He seems to be guilty.
9	Yes. C) Sami Al-Arian read newspapers, O'Reilly's Spin Zone TV Newscasts and CNN News. O'Reilly said he believed Al-Arian was guilty and he would spy on him everywhere he went in order to get evidence.	Yes. I heard that while Al-Arian was a professor at Univ. of So. Fl, he was also raising money to sponsor terrorist groups. I have discussed the case with my husband and sister-in-law. A) I was angry	Yes. C) I feel he is guilty and should be punished. D) Yes it would!	Yes. A) Mr. Martinez accused Mrs. Castor of doing nothing when the accusations about Al-Arian were made public. C) I feel he is guilty. D) Yes it would!	Yes	Guilty. Government (law officials) found evidence which incriminates him.	Yes	Yes. Personal
12	Yes. Newspaper ,local/national media the O'Reilley Factor that clearly shows that Sami Al-Arian is a contributor to terrorist organizations	I believe that Sami Al-Arian contributed to terrorist organizations	Yes	yes		Guilty News and the facts presented on the O'Reilley Factor	Yes	9/11
13		I saw on TV that he may have been involved in the 9/11 attack. A) Not good.			Yes	Guilty. What I saw on TV.	No	
14		I felt he should be tried or deported if this was true	It appears that he was involved from reports in the news and should be tried or deported	It seems he probably was involved in these activities and should be	Yes	Guilty: Media Reports Due to media reports I feel there is reason to	no	

				tried or deported d.Possibly		believe Dr. Al-Arian was involved in terrorist support		
16	B) Yes C) That they put Al-Arian in jail	No A) n/a	Yes. A) That Betty Castor knew about Al-Arian, and did not pull him out of USF College as a professor. C) If the facts were presented honestly I would say he's guilty unless he was being framed from someone overseas. D) Yes	Yes. A) That Betty Castor basically funded terrorism, or allowed it. B) Appalled to hear it. C) If the straight facts proved him guilty I would have to say guilty. D) Yes most likely.	Yes	No decision. I do believe they should get a fair trial but I don't think I should decide part of their verdict	Yes	No. The charges the Government has brought to these men are for a reason.
17	Yes c) I knew from newspaper -- how the college President got lots of grief in not firing Al-Arian from the beginning.	Yes. At ?????? We discussed that we believed he was guilty. A) I agreed -- he was guilty.	Yes. A) That Castor should have fired Al-Arian. B) I agreed on the firing. C) He's guilty. D) Yes!	Yes. A) Betty Castor should have fired Al-Arian. B) I believed it. C) He's guilty D) Yes!	Yes	Guilty. All the tv and paper news conversations w/ friends, etc. leads me to believe they're guilty.	Yes	No. Because I believe they are guilty.
18								
19			b		Yes. They are responsible for 9/11 and many American troops.	Guilty. Newspapers.	Probably not.	
20	B) Yes C) newspaper and tv, radio	No	Yes. A) Newspaper articles. B) How could she be running for the Senate? C) He should be found guilty. D) don't know.	Yes. A) Betty Castor handled the matter poorly. B) I disagree, she handled it ok. C) he guilty. D) Yes.	Yes	Guilty. Everything I've read. Don't like Arabs.	Yes	No.

25	C) I read that they participated in fundraising for terrorists organizations in the US. I read that Sami Al-Arian thinks "all Jews are monkeys or pigs" and he has begged for \$500 to kill a Jew in his fundraising speech.	A) I think Al-Arian has been involved with terrorist activities for a long time and he used his position at USF to help bring pij members to the US.	C) I believe there is evidence to implicate in the charges brought against him. D) Yes. I believe it would. In my eyes it is far easier to believe that one man is lying about his true nature than it is to believe that hundreds of government employees have conspired over 7 years to build a case against an innocent man.	C) I believe there is adequate evidence to substantiate the charges against him. D) Yes, I could not in my opinion with a mountain of evidence with the word of a person who is capable of the hateful statements he's made.	Yes.	Guilty. I believe in the end that the evidence will be overwhelming against these men and our system will have been burdened with the financial drain of proving the obvious.	Yes.	As with 9/11 these people demonstrate the ability to live amongst us while they plot against our citizens. The defendants apparently harbor hatred towards our way of life and believe it's their responsibility to God to eradicate us. Anyone who befriends or conspires with known terrorists should not be afforded "innocent until proven guilty!"
28	b) Yes. C) Read in paper, seen on TV charges. And featured on the accused.	Yes. Read and heard the charges against Al-Arian. Read about his teaching at USF, etc. A) I believe he is a threat to the US.	Yes. A) Mr. Deutsch stated that Mrs. Betty Castor did not do enough to get rid of Al-Arian at USF. Based on allegation. B) Again, I believe Al-Arian is a dangerous person. C) Again, I believe Al-Arian is a dangerous person. D) Yes.	Yes. A) It was a hated race with accusations going back and forth. Many attached Castor for not doing enough to terminate Al-Arian from USF. B) I really got tired of hearing about it. C) Again, he is a dangerous person. D) Yes.	Yes	Guilty	No	No.
31	Reports on TV and in newspapers for many months	Mr. Al-Arian presents many different faces. One is studious professor and another is a raving zealot	Based on the media it appears there is evidence against Mr. Al-Arian d I would like to hear all the evidence before I decide	So far I have seen and read data against mR. Al-Arian I would like to hear all the evidence	no	No decision Have not heard all the evidence	Yes	If the media presented evidence that he had been disallowed in court because of a technicality it would bother me.
34	That he was financing the terrorists	That he was probably guilty	He's guilty and he should be sent back to where he is from d Yes	Guilty d Yes	Don't know	Guilty. I feel he has ties with the terrorists.	Yes	I feel I've already made a judgment.

38	b) Yes C) Al-Arian was seen on video raising money for the Islamic Jihad. He was let go from USF because of the acts of terrorism.	Yes. Se above answer. News media, radio, talk shows, internet. A) They are guilty of terrorism and a threat to our country.	Yes. A) That Betty Castor would never do anything about Al-Arian. B) I didn't vote for her. C) I still believe he actively supports terrorism. D) Yes.	Yes. A) That Betty Castor refused to do anything about Al-Arian while at USF. B) Again, I didn't vote for her. C) Still feel he is guilty! D) yes.	Yes	Guilty. What I've seen in the news media has convinced me of Al-Arian's connection to terrorism.	Yes	No. I feel that I am already biased in the matter. No matter what I would believe in their guilt.
40	That Sami Al-Arian furnished money to terrorists organizations , at last he is being charged for such.	Answer to 40c	no	No	no	Guilty. I forget the details but without any evidence I would think he is guilty—if not he's a murder and should nebe brought to trial and if, a big if, he is proven to be as charged , he should be dealt with accordingly	no	
41								
42	b) Yes. C) The ongoing news coverage about Al-Arian keeps me informed on njews coverages, besides what I see, hear, and read on my own.	Yes. Reports about his fund raising activities to help terrorist. News reports, family and friends, and co-workers having discussions about him. A) It's alarming to me yhou can be working with someone in this country that are connected to those terrorist individuals that can bring harm to us and our families at any time.	Yes. A) With most people that I spoke to had the opinion that she was too soft on him and appeared to hope the situation would go away. B) I was amazed to see how she handled the whole situation. C) From what I know he is involved with terrorists. I do not trust him. I feel our country has been harmed enough by people like him. D) Yes	Yes. A) He continued to point out Castor's mishandling of the entire situation with Sami. C) Please see question 44C again I do not trust him. D) Yes.	Yes	Guilty. Everything I've heard seen or read up to now has made me believe that he is guilty.	Yes	No. Based on my previous answers I have formed an opinion that is biased against the defendents.
43	b) Yes. C) Read all about it on the internet.	No. A) Who knows. The press screws every story they write up.	No. C) Who knows. Government only tells us what they want us to know. D) Yes	No	Yes	No decision. By the newspaper, internet he's already guilty.	Yes.	Yes. I don't want to be there. I don't care. So it will be impossible for me to pay attention.

48	B) Yes. C) TV, General reports of Al-Arian's activities as related to these charges.	Yes. Dr. Al-Arian only. TV, Newspapers. Same as question 40. No discussions. A) Guilty of those actions, miss-usig his position as a teacher to further his persona agenda, detrimental to this country and its interests, therefore mine and my relatives.	Yes. A) Betty Castor was President of USF at the time and should have at least suspended Dr. Al-Arian very early in the process. C) Most likely guilty of supporting ideas that are detrimental to this country and used his position to advance his causes. D) Yes	Yes. A) Betty Castor lost the race because of her mishandling of Dr. Al-Arian. B) she misjudged his involvement and failed to act appropriately, especially in light of what happened Sept. 11, 2001, the entire country has to be more aware of terrorists in our society. D) Yes.	Yes	Guilty. As explained in Question 44-C and 45-B.	Yes. Because of increased terrorists acts and the threat of future acts.	Yes, Some of their means is not justified.
50		d	D) Probably.	C) He appears to be guilty. D) Probably.	No	No decision. I have my reservations about their innocence.	No	No
54								
55		9	x					
58	C) Guilty	No. A) Guilty	No. C) Who knows. Government only tells us what they want us to know. D) Yes	No.	Yes	Guilty. 911	No	No
59	x	That he had ties with terrorists.			Yes.	No decision.	I don't know.	
61	Yes c) news - raised money	Yes. Read about college and problems	Yes a) Election ads - (Castor's). C) He seems to be involved in alquida group. D) Yes.	c) He don't need to be teaching our kids. D) Yes.	No	Guilty. Don't know enough!	Yes.	Yes. I am a Christian. It's hard to believe anything a Palestine/Muslim says.

67		Yes. I saw newscasts, read it in the newspaper, and heard it on the radion. A) I did not think it was right for Dr. Al-Arian to remain employed at USF with such serious allegations against him.	Yes. A) There were allegations that stated Betty Castor knew Al-Arian was a terrorist supporter. C) I feel that it was wrong for Al-Arian to fund terrorist groups. D) I don't think I would be impartial because I have heard too much about Dr. Sami Al-Arian. I already have an impression he funded terrorist groups.	Yes. A) I saw the ads on TV stating Betty Castor knew Al-Arian funded and was a member of a terrorist group. C) I have formed the opinion that he funded a terrorist group. D) Yes, I already have an impression of the defendant.	Yes.	Guilty The news coverage on the case led me to believe it.	Yes.	No. Yes, I have heard a lot of media coverage and have the impression Al-Arian funded a terrorist group.
70	x	x	x	x				
71	B) Yes. C) Yes, one of the defendants was a professor at USF and currently is in jail.	A) They are guilty!	Yes. B) Disgusted by the entire event. C) I would not be a fair juror on this trial. I think he's guilty. D) Yes.	Yes. A) I remember the news ads were very dirty.		Guilty		
76		?	x					
78		That this person should not be teaching our college kids	He is due a fair trial but most people believe him guilty d. Yes		no	No decision	no	
80		?	?					
82	B) Yes. C) Regarding Al-Arian, the fact that he was using funds for terrorists against our country.	No. A) That Sami Al Arian is involved with terrorists.	No.	Yes. A) Just during the election process - where they were (votes)- how many they had.	Yes.	Guilty. I just believe he has ties to terrorism based on things I have heard.	Yes	No. I have strong opinions on terrorists and terrorism.
84			?					
86		A) I think the man should be tried and found guilty. That's fair, but I really in my heart think that he is guilty.	C) He should be jailed and not given anymore American rights. D) Yes - very.	D) Yes, very.	No	Guilty. Too many things point to his guilt.	Yes.	I just see that there is too much against this man.

90	b) Yes. C) Al-Arian - Supports Islamic Jihad. Used his position at USF to channel funds to Jihad and bring members into the country. Hammoudeh ?????????	Yes. Saw Bill O'Reilly's story, discussed situation with family and friends at USF. Al-Arian definitely seems to be connected with Jihad. A) Al-Arian seems to have strong connections to Jihad, and the Jihad are responsible for killing people.	Yes. After receiving notification from federal services about Al-Arian's terrorist ???, Betty Castor was not able to fire him. C) He is connected to Terrorists!!!! D) Yes.	C) He is involved with the Islamic extremist group Jihad. D) Yes.	Yes.	Guilty. I get the impression Al-Arian supported the Jihad. This is enough for me to be biased.	Yes.	No. I will be as fair and objective as possible. I do however, already feel that Al-Arian has involvement with the Jihad and have a major problem with this terrorist organization.
91	?							
92		x						
93								
94								
95		I felt he should have been arrested and I believe they were guilty at the time	I believe he is guilty but he deserves a fair trial	I believe he is guilty but he deserves a fair trial.d.No	no	Guilty Just what I have seen on the news	no	
97	B) Yes. C) About alleged ties with terrorist parties and Sami Amin Al-Arian.	No.	Yes. A) Mrs. Castor's alleged knowledge of Mr. Al-Arian's ties and support of terrorist activity. B) Appalled that someone might have this knowledge and keep it to themselves. C) undecided. D) Yes.	Yes. Slander between both parties. C) Undecided. D) Yes.	Yes.	No decision.	Yes.	Yes. Have formed opinion.

101		x	I am only going on what I have read in the media, but as an American whose husband, brother and nephew served in the military and who grieved along with all other Americans, on 9/11, I of course have formed some opinions on this man so closely tied to terrorist activities. It may be difficult, although I would like to feel that I would go into any trial with a clear mind regarding innocence or guilt in any case. This case, though, is close to my heart as it would be any patriotic American.	I believe reports that he is tied to an organization, tied to Jihad.		Guilty. Only as a citizen defending my country and judging these people by what I've read and heard, not a final decision.	Yes	I want to be fair, but I love my country, I may be persuaded to find the defendant guilty if I feel the minute possibility exists that there is involvement in terrorism.
102			x					
104								
106								
109								
110		x						
111								
113	C) I have seen Al-Arian all over the local news about his involvement in terrorist organizations.		b	b	Yes	Guilty. Evidence in the paper, news stations.	Yes	
114	Al-Arian helped fund the terrorists of 9/11.		C) I feel as those Dr. Al-Arian is guilty.	Yes. C) I feel as those all persons involved are guilty.	Yes	Guilty. What I have read in the newspapers and see on TV. 50-Guilty	Yes	I feel as though all are guilty. I feel as those the government takes payoffs.
116	Just the ethnic and terrorism aspects/allegations will be hard to accept or deny.		Good gosh, it can't be someone pretending to be someone/something you are number 1. C) Do not trust. D) Yes.	C) It's a hard call, trust is hard to get back once allegations are made public. D) Yes.		Guilty. It's hard to be biased in this issue. I try as a teacher to be unbiased fair role model, be fair and trust-worthy. I have a lot to upkeep trust.	Yes.	It's sway mindset and stereotyping.
119								

120	C) They are accused of funding terrorist activities and plots and make out like ordinary people.	A) It has been going on so long, most of the facts are forgotten by all.	D) I'm not sure.	C) Outrage that he's probably at least somewhat behind this. D) I'm not sure.	No	Guilty. The government has tons of evidence of at least some acts and has been shown these people could pull a 9/11 on us. They were in Tampa.	No.	No.
122								
124		A) If Sami Al-Arian is on record for supporting these "charitable" groups that are actually terrorist groups, then I believe that he is someone who supports/incites terrorist attacks or activities against the United States.	D) Right now I think he's guilty. There would have to be overwhelming evidence to convince me of his innocence. I don't know if that labels me impartial or not.	Yes	No	Guilty. Footage aired on TV news allegedly shows Sami Al-Arian speaking in support of terrorist groups and activities. 50. Sami Al-Arian has ties directly or indirectly to Qaidia or other terrorist groups.	Yes.	I already think he's guilty based on news and publicity. I assuming that means I am not impartial.
125	C) That they were involved in an organization that funded terrorist groups.	A) That there is a high likelihood that they had close connections to terrorist groups.	C) That he indeed participated in terrorist activities. D) possibly.	Same as # 44.	No		Yes	Having worked in the Arab world for 13 years, I have formed some prejudices that the average person might not have. It is a collectivist society, something the average individualistic American does not comprehend.
130	USF professor accused of terrorist funding and organizing.	Yes. The news. Dr. Al-Arian has strong ties with terrorists. A) Send them all back to Iran.	43. B) I think he's guilty and be executed. 44 - bland		No	Guilty.	Yes.	See 31, 32, 33, etc.
131	Allegations on TV and Newspapers	Allegations on TV and Newspapers	Don't know	Don't know	Don't know	No decision	yes	I would not feel comfortable in the situation
134		?						
135								
136								

137	Detention on undisclosed charges and that Al-Arian was funding money to terrorists.	A) Probably guilty and it must be something big for the government to keep charges secret.	C) Probably had ties to terrorists. D) Don't know.		Don't know.	Probably guilty. The ongoing coverage; where there's smoke there's fire.	Yes.	Lots of negative news reports.
138								
139	C) TV news reports, newspaper articles, comments from my parents.	A) I feel that Sami Al-Arian and his supporters are liars and terrorists and that they use our freedoms in the US as a cover for their terrorist activities.	43. I think he is a terrorist. 44. C) I think he is a terrorist. D) Yes	C) I think he is a terrorist. D) Yes.	Yes	Guilty. What I have read and heard from the newspaper and my parents.	No	
141		x	x?					
142	C) The defendants were part of a terrorist ring that were raising money for terrorists in the middle east.	A) Felt negatively towards Muslims.	43. Yes. Felt statements made were untrue. 44. No	No.	Yes	Guilty. News reports that lead me to believe that he is not innocent.	Yes.	I already heard too many negative news reports about this issue to give a fair opinion.
144	x		C) I thought Al-Arian was guilty of organizing terrorist activities against the USA. D) Quite honestly, yes.	Thought Al-Arian guilty of organizing. D) Yes.	Yes.	Guilty. General news.	Yes.	Quite honestly I'm not sure I could separate the emotionalism over 9/11 and the facts.
146		A) Probably guilty.	Yes. C) That there is a very good chance that he is guilty. D) I would try to be fair and impartial, but I'm not positive that I could be.	C) That he is probably guilty.	Yes.	No decision. Think he is guilty.	Yes.	I do not know if I would be fair to the defendant because of impressions from reading and hearing about him and my personal fear of terror.
150	Of, course, he's (Sami Al-Arian) is in our "backyard". He did take a nice photo at the Whitehouse function	Just monor talk when it happened. I think our country is doing as best as it can with security	If he is guilty, I do have a problem with any individual that lives here, living a good life making US dollars .It's not Benedict Arnold , but it does bite the hand that feeds you . Maybe. but I am pretty fair	Not as it related to Senate race	no	No. I do not know some of the defendants	Yes	I do not racial profile , but I do know about some of these defendants because of the media and proximity of them which peaked interest.

151		A) Feel Al-Arian abused his position and resources at USF; believe he has ties to terrorists and assisted in supporting them; believe he violated some immigration laws. 43) Yes, that he should not be allowed in the US; that he supports terrorists' causes; that he abused position at and resources at USF.	C) that he is guilty of supporting terrorist causes; that he abused his privileges of being in the US; that he abused resources at USF in order to further his personal political agenda D) Yes.	Guilty of abusing resources at his disposable to further his personal agenda of supporting terrorists causes; guilty of violating immigration laws and abusing privilege of being in US. D) Yes.	Yes. Negatively influenced by numerous media reports.	Guilty. I believe enough has been discovered to show he supports terrorists causes and that he abused his privilege of being in the US.	Yes.	Have already a lot about Al-Arian through media and would be hard to disregard.
152								
163			C) He should be tried for treason. D) No	C) Glad to see him on trial.	No.	No decision.	No.	
166								
168								
170			C) I believe they were right in firing him and should stand trial for his acts. D) By all means!!	D) By all means!!	Yes.	Guilty. I believe that what I have heard in the media is true.	Yes.	Have already formed an opinion.
171								
172		x						
175			x	x!				
178			Disgusted. C) Anyone that wants to be in the US and fund terrorists, needs to be punished. D) Yes.	Anyone that wants to be in the US and fund terrorists, needs to be punished. D) Yes.	No	No decision. In a way I want to say guilty but then you have to let the judicial system work, but I do feel I am biased because of 9/11, the war.	Yes.	I am worried that my fear of terrorist would affect me to be fair and impartial.
179	C) Al-Arian has held his positions in Islamic Jihad, served in ...and used this position to collect funds for terrorist organizations. I believe the other defendants are tied in with Al-Arian activities in support of terrorist activities.	A) Al-Arian used his teaching position to recruit and fund terrorist organization. USF campus was pro-Muslim and anti-conservative hot-bed in years past.	C) I feel that he is part of the terror network that has formed in the US. In fact, vicious terror group-Islamic Jihad. D) Probably yes. I would like to think I could be unbiased but knowing what I do about the case, I don't feel it would be in anyone's best interest to be placed in the	C) Sami-Al-Arian took advantage of his position at USF to promote terrorism, training fund. D) Yes.	Yes.	Guilty. The stories recounted in the Press, O'Reilly factor were very convincing.	Yes.	Everything I have heard about this case would tend to indicate the government is justified in bringing case to trial. Whether the government can prove its case remains to be seen. At this juncture, I support the government's

			situation.					case.
180								
184			C) Sami Al-Arian has connections to people that are reported to be terrorists. D) I would have difficulty in being impartial.	D) I would have difficulty being impartial.		No decision.	Yes.	Pg. 15 and 16 of this questionnaire.
185			?					
187		Giving and passing info and funding terrorists. Outrage	Based on what I have heard if true I would find it difficult to find him innocent d No		No	No decision. I would have to hear facts from both sides	n	
189		A) He should have been deported and not allowed to work in the US.	C) I feel that he has been working to support terrorists. D) Yes.	C) I feel that Dr. Sami Al-Arian should be an enemy of the USA. D) Yes.	Yes?	Guilty. What I've read and heard about his beliefs make me feel this way.	Yes.	I feel that the defendants are guilty.
191								
193							Yes	Too much fighting on both sides
194	C) Sami Al-Arian was fired from his professor position...for helping fund the attacks on the United States and also he was the head of a think tank in Tampa supporting terrorism.		C) I believe he was directly involved in terrorist activity that can be traced to 9/11. D) Yes, I believe that it would be very difficult for me to be fair and impartial.		Yes.	Guilty.	Yes.	I think they are all guilty of some wrong doing as it relates to terrorist attacks and crimes against the US.
195	C) Sami Al-Arian was supporting bin Laden.	I heard on the news he was professor here in FL as well as an al-queda supporter. A) I think he was supporting a terrorist.	C) Sami Al-Arian supports Osama bin Laden and is therefore responsible for 9/11 attacks. D) Yes, it will be difficult but I believe I can set it aside.		Yes.	Guilty. I saw Mr. Al-Arian on the news after 9/11 and he new and supported Osama bin Laden.	Yes.	I think Al-Arian is guilty of supporting terrorism, but I also believe that I am not as informed as I'd like to be to form an opinion.
197								
198								

199								
203		I have seen the numerous reports on TV and heard comments from friends. My impression was that he was guilty. Impressions are that he is anti-American.	C) He is tied to terrorism and against America. D) Yes.	D) Possibly	Yes.	Guilty. The news reports and comments from friends.	Yes.	It would be hard to be fair to an Arab I believe to be guilty.
204								
207		A) I wondered why it took them so long to build a case against Dr. Al-Arian. It seems like the evidence was there a long time before they arrested him. 43. I wondered how he could stay and live in the this country without being asked to leave.	C) Based on what I have read and seen on TV, he should have been arrested a long time before he was. D) Yes, I think he 99.9% likely to be guilty of what he is being charged with based on what I have seen, heard and read about on TV and in the newspaper.	C) I believe that Dr. Al-Arian along with his partners helped to raise money and funnel that money to organizations that are against the US. D) Yes, having lived with the hate that Arabs and Palestinians have for the US, makes me wonder why we would give assistance to these types of individuals or countries.	Yes.	Guilty. Everything that I have read and heard about this case has lead me to believe that he and his group are guilty.	Yes.	I would have a hard time being fair and impartial to people who take life for granted.
212								
216		?	?					
217		?						
219			?					
221	C) Sami Al-Arian contributed to terrorism.	A) Guilty	He was a terrorist I believed it, he's guilty, yes.	Guilty	Yes	Guilty. Media news.	Yes.	Don't like terrorists.
229								
230								
231								
234	I have heard discussion of this matter through the University's newspaper and fellow students who attend.	Through the media, bay news 9, I talked about this with friends and family. The case and its details were discussed. He's guilty.	43. He's guilty.	He's guilty.	Yes.	Guilty. Through extensive media coverage of these events.	Yes.	Because of the extensive media coverage of this case.
237			?			g		

238					Yes.	No decision.	Yes.	I'm a traditional Catholic Christian I feel the Islamic people as a whole, hate us.
242								
244								
245		I was terrified with what I have read and saw on the news and very angry as well.	C) I really believe that Dr. Sami Al-Arian is guilty with terrorist involvement. D) Yes because I already think he is guilty.	D) Yes I already think he is guilty.	Yes.	Guilty. Reading all the information in the media and news has led me to believe that one and possible all are guilty of terrorist acts.	Yes	Because with what I have read and heard they are guilty.
246		A) I heard about their involvement with terrorists acts. Many co-workers and I have talked about this topic at work I was terrified with what I have read and saw on the news and very angry as well.	C) I really believe the Dr. Al-Arian is guilty with terrorist involvement. D) Yes, because I already think that he's guilty.	D) Yes, I already think that he is guilty.	Yes.	Guilty. Reading all the information in the media and news has led me to believe that one and possibly all are guilty of terrorist acts. 50. I strongly feel that Al-Arian is guilty of terrorist acts.	Yes.	Because of what I have heard and read they are guilty.
251		I think he is guilty of terrorist participation and threatening those in our military. He should go back to live in a country he supports			No	No decision	G Yes	80.-If I sense the slightest hint of terrorism I will automatically believe the defendants are guilty. 82 As I said I will be hard to convince that the defendants are innocent based on their race and religious beliefs.
253		A) He should be fired and deported.		C) Isn't treason punishable by death? He betrayed America. D) Yes because he's only going to lie and blame	No	Guilty. They probably did whatever they are charged with to fund terrorist cells in America.	Yes.	I think they are guilty. Al-Arian has already admitted his guilt.

				America for the things he had to do.				
260	That Al-Arian is link to terrorists at here and abroad and is head of the Jihad.		C) I cannot give a good answer to this. I am vary bias. D) Yes, very much so. I sorry but that's my feelings.	C) I think about 9/11 and I think what the government think. If your prove it. convict him. D) Yes.	Yes.	Guilty. Of him being attached to the Jihade group.	Yes.	He is being aquaze of being a terrorist.
265								
266		My impression is that of suspicion being raised regarding terrorist activity or money being handled.43. I am concerned w.what I have read or heard, especially being so close to home	c.I have formed no opinions. My feelings are that of being concerned about my well being and the well being of others d. Yes. I believe I would	d. Yes	No	No decision	Yes	I believe the defendants have knowledge of what they are being accused of.
267			C) If the man dislikes us why is he here. Possibly to raise money for terrorist operations. D) Yes.	C) I believe that a person who dislikes us that much can only be in the US for other than lawful purposes D) Yes.	Yes.	Guilty. Newscasts of Al-Arian's cornments about the US and non-Muslims.	Yes.	Like have I have previously written, I believe Al-Arian was in the US for other than lawful purposes judging from his statements.
268								
269			Yes	The man is guilty. He should be put away. D) Yes.	Yes	Guilty. Just everything that happened.	No.	83. I think the men are guilty.
270								
271		43. Why don't they stay in their countries if they hate us?	D) Yes	D) Yes.	Yes. Evidence seems conclusive.	Guilty. I think for sure-- media coverage.	No.	83. I guess 9/11 weighs heavily on all Americans.
273								
276								
280		?		No decision				
281								
282		I feel a little unsettled that the terrorists can live so close by	None formed d not sure	See 44	no	No decision. Don't know enough	Yes	I'm Jewish & I have a negative opinion about terrorists.

286	I have read and heard that Al-Arian was funneling funds to Alqauid and other Arab groups opposed to the US.	Suspicious that they did what was alleged.	C) I am suspicious he is guilty of what he is accused of. D) I would be uncomfortable with my ability to be fair to the accused parties because of what is going on in Iraq.	C) I am suspect about his guilt. D) Not sure, but not real comfortable.	No	No decision.	No	
287	C) Have seen Headline News for removing him from USF and controversial tapes of anti-American views.	Al-Arian controversial teaching, terrorist ties. A) Not good.	Yes.	D) Yes.	Yes.	Guilty. All the news reports.	Yes.	I'm already prejudice before anyone presents anything.
289								
290	g	His connections with terrorism and profiteering through the media and read in newspaper. A) That he should either be deported or arrested and tried for his crimes.	C) I think he should not be allowed to live in the US. D) Yes.	C) My opinion is that Al-Arian is guilty of his crimes. D) Yes.		Guilty.	Yes.	The charge of funneling money to terrorists. I have no sympathy for anyone involved with terrorism.
294								
296		I followed the case closely in print and TV, college reports, stink over not firing Al-Arian and public outcry for deportation or jailing of same. A) Disgust at laws preventing kicking the man out of college and wanting to scream, leave my country!	B) Disgust. C) He is a terrorist supporter. D) Yes.	C) I believe that he supports causes that employ violent solutions for religious beliefs. D) Yes, I dispise other religions/all religions taking a holier than thou position.	Yes.	Guilty. Strong dislike of any religion taking arms against others solely because they are not of the same belief system. 50. Al-Arian connections to charity groups for PLO operations.	Yes.	I already Al-Arian guilty.
302		43. He lies.	C) I don't believe or trust him. D) Yes.	b	Yes	Guilty. Nephew killed by Arab terrorists. 50. My opinion does not count; they are all guilty in some way.	Yes.	Nephew killed in World Trade Center

303		I felt he should not be allowed to teach at USF after the suspicions were raised.	b	C) I generally feel he's guilty. D) Yes.	Yes	Guilty. Sorry it's just my immediate opinion.	Yes.	My desire for "getting back" at terrorists is very strong. I am afraid my assumptions of Dr. Al-Arian's guilt will get in the way.
304		That Al-Arian is guilty	Al-Arian is guilty .d somewhat		no	Guilty Statements in the media concerning the large volume of evidence about Al-rian	No	Only my disposition that Al-Arian's guilty
305	I followed the Al-Arian arrest wvery closely in the news & on cable TV	Very negative—used American freedoms against Americans —hid behind our liberties	Yes—I would try very hard to be fair and impartial but terrorism is something that is difficult to be impartial about	c. He used USF as a cover /manipulated the university system. D. it would be difficult but I would try to be fair.	NO	Guilty. I would listen to the evidence presented and try to b e fair—but from what I have read he appears to be guilty	Yes	Terrorism is not defendable – there is right to free & impartial jury. Difficult to obtain when terror is involved
307		A) I certainly believe the government has a very good reason to bring all to trial. I believe that Dr. Al-Arian did raise funds for use against USA.	B) I was sickened by this situation. How can some come to the "home of the free" and raise monies to fight against us. C) In my opinion he is guilty, should be tried for treason and imprisoned and his family should be returned to their homeland. D) Yes	D) Yes	Yes	Guilty	Yes.	I do not believe Dr. Al-Arian is innocent.
310			So far the evidence is against him d. Yes		no	No decision	no	
314	That these people are connected with terrorism	Newspapers, TV, internet , TV and AcquaintancesUSF	Honestly, I am going to have to be convinced that they are innocent d No	D Maybe	no	Guilty Until I'm convinced of their innocence	no	It is important my identity be kept secret from the defendants and the media
315	That they may have had something to do with financing terrorism	c. That he could possibly be guilty d Yes but try to be impartial	C. That he could be guilty d. Yes-but try to be impartial	no			Yes	Would try to be fair but I love my country and the thought of anyone trying to harm us I can't tolerate.

316	News media coverage on Al-Arian as a USF professor & his link to terrorism; his brother-in-laws involvement as well	A) I feel they are both guilty of terrorism acts against the US.	C) I feel Al-Arian is a threat either directly or indirectly to the US citizens, and that he is guilty of the crimes as charged. D) Yes. My opinions are formed and extremely unlikely to change.	C) What I've read/heard points to Al-Arian's guilt and basically it's hard not to see his guilty when he's labeled a terrorist. D) Yes, very difficult to be impartial.	Yes	Guilty. Reports on the defendant's connection to terrorist organizations, money laundering charges, monies paid to individuals to carry out suicide attacks.	Yes.	Terrorism charges are hard to swallow after 9/11; if you live in America you should not be involved in activities that are harmful to American citizens.
318	C) That they were involved in 9/11 terrorist activities.		C) He is guilty. D) Yes	C) He is guilty. D) Yes	Yes	Guilty	Yes	
320	C) Newspaper and TV stories leave me to believe they are all guilty. They had the funds and opportunity to do these things.	A) Upset that others can come to American and get away with anything.	C) The man and all of his co-defendants are guilty! D) Yes	C) I feel that the group had been planning some terrorist activities for a long time. They had been spreading the word to others around the country for more support and were never stopped. D) Yes	Yes	Guilty. As stated before, the group (as to reports on TV and newspapers) had plenty of papers, etc which proved what they were doing.	No. 80. I feel the government will have enough evidence to prove their case before coming to court or they will stall for more time.	
321		43. He should be deported after prison.	C) Guilty D) Yes	h	Maybe	Guilty and no decision! He has been arrested and he is probably guilty.	g	
326	A) He's more than suspicious!	x	C) He better have a very good case to prove his innocence. D) Yes	C) He would have to have a lot of great evidence to prove he's not guilty. D) Yes.	Yes.	Guilty. Media ads, newscasts that constantly brings it up in a bad light.	Yes.	Because of the ongoing animosity against the middle east people.

329			C) Initial impression is that he has connections with people who have an anti-American agenda and may be connected with terrorist cells. D) ...I don't know how Dr. Al-Arian will get a fair and unbiased trial in this country.	see 44	No	No decision.	I don't think so.	
330								
336	Send the information Bay News (9) w relations to potential connect to Sept 11 01 event.		C) He is guilty of offence. D) Yes	C) That he is guilty of this event. D) Yes	No.	Guilty. Noone would be detained for this long without some truth to the offence. 50. They are guilty.	Yes.	I believe they are guilty.
337	Terrorist cell being funded with the help of his group	I believe it to be true. I feel there is some level of involvement			No No decision I do not have an opinion on all the defendants. Sami Al-Arian is the only defendant I have heard about in the news.		no	
338		A) I feel that Al-Arian is a terrorist by raising the money necessary to finance killing innocent people.	A) That he was a terrorist living here in Tampa operating from USF. B) Angry that his presence was allowed and paid for by the State of Florida. C) Al-Arian is a terrorist and works against the United States and our allies both here and abroad. D) Yes.	Same as # 44. D) Yes	Yes	Guilty	Yes.	Already made up my mind about defendants.
339		41. Guilty	C) His people should not be able to enter our country. D) Yes	C) Guilty D) Yes	Yes	Guilty, previous evidence.	Yes	Defendants are guilty.
340	That they are guilty of terrorist activities.	41. They are all terrorists. 43. Would like to hand him over to the peoples of the	C) He is a terrorist and should be dealt with as such. D) Yes, yes, yes.	C) Bad man. D) Yes, yes, yes.	Yes.	Guilty. Gut feelings and distrust.	Yes	I believe they are guilty and should be punished for all of their crimes.

		United States.						
343		A) I was angry that such people are allowed to operate at a major state University.		C) I don't trust him. I feel he is probably guilty, I don't feel sorry for him. D) Probably yes.	Yes	Guilty. I just think he is guilty, video tapes don't lie, he looks like a terrorist.	Yes.	I think the guys are guilty. 83. What if these defendants are found guilty? What about the retaliation against the jurors. What's to stop their affiliates from coming after us? Or bombing the court house, etc. "?"
344								
346								
347		x						
348		A) Anger that college professor who can influence young minds was allowed to operate terrorist operation.	C) That he acted against the United States. D) Yes	b	No	Guilty. Much of the press has written accounts including O'Reilly. He has been in Federal prison 2 years without trial - the government has strong evidence that he is a dangerous person given this situation.	Yes.	May have some prejudices against terrorist activity provided my tour is in the middle east. This is a difficult situation. I feel I am normally a fair person who can see both sides. In this case, and based on my personal experiences...I may harbor unknown prejudices...
349		43. B) That he raised money to support terrorist groups against the USA.	b	b			Yes	Defendants - already have a partial opinion. US gov - feel is wrong to detain without charges.
350	Sami Al-Arian is in jail for funding terrorists	Good work to the Feds	C I am curious what evidence they have against him d No		no	Guilty They must have something on him to hold him in jail for this long	no	
351	Media newspapers	Guilty			no	Guilty	no	

352	C) I down loaded the indictments from the internet and studied them. I avidly followed the case in the media.	A) They both have a long history of anti-Israel, anti-semitic statements. They raise money for terrorist groups and claim it is for humanitarian purposes. They use our freedoms to ply their campaigns of hate.	C) I am very hopeful that the facts will prove to an unbiased jury that Mr. Al-Arian and his cronies are guilty of international terrorist acts. I then hope the government seeks a sentence of death for all of them. D) Yes.	see 44 46. Yes He should never have been allowed into this country. He is an Islamic terrorist.	Yes.	No decision. I feel very strongly that the statements made by Al-Arian and company vowing to drive the Israelis into the sea show his true colors. I have not felt the same way about Islamics since 9/11 and the latest intafida in Isreal.	Yes	I am quite positive I could not separate my personal views on the causes of Islamic terrorism from the facts in this case. That is unfair to both sides in the process.
355								
356	g	g	C) I believe he is linked with terrorists and is one of the people sent to infiltrate our country and to use the freedoms we have against us.	C) I believe he is guilty, that if is a citizen that it should be revoked and that he should go to jail. D) Yes - I believe his lawyers will use every legal loop-hole to get him off.	Yes.	Guilty. Newspapers, TV	Yes	
362		A) Guilty	b	b	Yes	Guilty.	Yes	Affiliations with terror groups appear to be too strong to be impartial.
365			b	b		Guilty		
366	That there is a possible terroristic connection with the defendants.	43. I believe he was involved in raising money for the palas.	b	b	No	Guilty. The events of 9/11.	Yes.	Because I formed an opinion.
367		41. That they are terrorist.	C) I think he is involved since blood is thicker than H2O. D) Yes.	D) Yes.		News accounts.	Yes.	Too much publicity. 83. I think the biggest fear of people to serve on this jury will be reprisal. How do you know if you are in harms way from these people? I feel intimidated.

369			C) He is guilty. D) Yes	C) He is guilty. D) Yes	Yes	Guilty. Where there is smoke there is fire. 50. They are all guilty.	Yes.	I've already convicted them.
370	News reports	Not good	That Dr. Al_Arain is a supporter of Palestinian rights and is against US policy to Israel d. Yes	Yes	no	No decision no		
372		X	b	b				
374	x		?	?				
375			b	b			g	
379		x	b	b				
381								
384	Media newspapers TV	His supposed connection with terrorists d. Seemed believable	I feel some of the things printed and said about his involvement in certain terrorist organizations have been correct d I would have to dispel all the things I have heard and seen beyond a reasonable doubt	My opinion is that I feel he has had some illegal involvement with terrorist ties d Yes	No	No decision Haven't heard all the facts	Yes	I have formed an opinion on some of the defendants , due to the media
386		A) Given the amount of time this has gone on and the number of times he has been suspected the time has finally come to convict him.	d. Not if this were the only factor	d. Not if this were the only factor	Yes	Guilty. Everything I've read and heard, I think that this is one clear case of "if there's smoke there's fire".	Yes	I'd be going into this case believing from what I know and believe that Al-Arian is probably guilty.
388								
389	x	A) In my opinion of what I read that they are accessory to commit terrorist crimes in Israel and the occupied territories. I am against crimes of violence and I stand by my USA country. Authorities have tapes where Al-Arian proclaims "death to Israel" and "let us damn America" in Arabic.	C) Law enforcements must have enough evidence to find Al-Arian guilty. D) Yes, I don't think I could be a fair and impartial juror since the government have all the proves they need to prosecute him and find him guilty.	C) If what he was doing was a minor thing probably he could go free. But he was under investigation for many years so they may have hard evidence to find him guilty. D) It certainly effect my decision because of the publicity	Yes	Guilty. Guilty on counts of lying about of belonging to terrorists organizations and for helping those individuals in foreign countries to commit murder and crimes, and who knows if they may have links to al qaida's group and bin Laden and September	Yes	I think they are going to be found guilty.

				of this case everyone knows about it.		11 destruction and death of many innocent people. 50. I think they will be found guilty in all counts.		
392		Discuss the situation with everyone I know. Is he was he did he ever have connections with Al Queda and now many people in the country are contributing to their cause	B) Well if the government has kept him in prison this long they must have a fairly good case against him. C) I try to be partial and of course until now hear all regarding the charge I feel he was involved in some way. D) Yes.		Yes.	Guilty. His arrest and no getting out of jail until his trial.	Yes.	I think the government of the US must have a good case, or they will be spending a lot of our money on the trial.
394								
396		43. B) He claimed to be innocent, but when reading his statements I felt he was guilty and untruthful.	C) I felt he is not telling the truth and has many things hidden from his past. D) Yes.	C) Still believe he is hiding things that involve the US. D) Yes.	Yes	Guilty. Based on all media there does not appear to be any truth as to what he says.	Yes	I could be fair to the government view, but have a problem to the defendants because of all the coverage it has received and feel cannot trust anything that he has declare as true.
398		A) Believed him to be involved in acts against the US. 43. B) Films on TV of him berating the US and wanting money to send over to far east.	C) Guilty. D) Yes.	C) He is guilty. D) Yes.	Yes	Guilty.	Yes	
399								
401								
402	I've read most of the articles in the St. Pete Times on this subject	Media report-TV and newspapers. I don't have specific recollection, except that he was a university	No	No	No I try not to judge any individual based on what the		Yes	I hope I can give each person the benefit of the doubt. but I am suspicious of Arabs in

		professor and may have been supporting terrorists. Probably had discussions with family and friends. If its true then anger and disgust. I don't generally feel until I hear results of investigation. No			media reports			general—although I have no problems with the ones I have met and worked with—it is a form of prejudice that I'm not proud of but I do feel that way back on the state of our world today.
404		A) I am appalled that a state university would employ such a person. Did they not check him out -- especially after 9/11?	C) I was angry that anyone could come to this country, do whatever they want, hurt us, and get paid for it in the process. D) Yes.	These type of people should not be allowed in this country. D) Yes	Yes.	Guilty. Based on what I've heard/read there has to be evidence of guilt. Otherwise why would he be charged and his brother-in-law kicked out? 50. He must be guilty because all the evidence presented thus far.	Yes	I believe they're guilty.
406	x							
407			b	b				
408								
410		X	b	b				
411								
417								
418	C) HELLO HELLO!!	I think he's guilty. 43. Yes, he hates the United States and undoubtedly all Americans.	b	b	Yes.	Guilty. Come on. See previous questions and answers.	Yes. You know they did it.	Our government has not always been completely fair and impartial to us US citizens.
419	That there were financial support/contributions made an effort to support terrorists and terrorists attacks. Mr. Al-Arian had been suspected for some time while at USF as being at least a sympathizer and probably a contributor to terrorists and their attacks.	A astonishment that he was ever allowed into our country.	C) If all this turns out to be true, I want to know why these people are allowed to stay where they obviously hate and want to harm innocent Americans. D) Probably.	D) I would be very surprised if the people accused in this case could prove innocence. How could anyone be unbiased?	No	No decision. While I do believe guilt must be proved and the government must prove this I don't believe as high profile as this case is they would have undisputable evidence.	No sure.	
421								

422			?	?				
423		x		b				
425		He's a terrorist.	C) He's at least sympathetic to terrorists organizations. D) Yes.	b	Yes	Guilty. Local and national press.	Yes.	Preconceived guilt.
426		A) Why would they allow him in the state and work at the college with terrorist thoughts?	C) Based on what I know I think Mr. Al-Arian should be locked up and never regain freedom. We must keep this country safe. D) Maybe	C) He should be kept locked up because there is no place for terrorist in the US. D) Maybe.	Yes	Guilty	No	
427								
428								
431	C) Sami Amin Al-Arian was involved in terrorism in the US.	A) Justice should be served.	C) I think he could have been involved. D) Yes.	C) They think he is guilty and justice should be served. D) Yes.	Yes	Guilty. Based on what I have heard from media and friends.	Yes.	I don't think they should have been in the US and a professor at a university.
432		A) Yes he is one!	C) His imprison is good and keep him out of the US. D) Yes.	C) He is one and he should not be in the US. D) Yes I will not make a good juror.	Yes.	Guilty. News.	Yes	The defendant guilty.
438		Unsure of Dr. Sami guilt	No opinions formed	No opinions formed	no	No decision g	no	
439	That the men are guilty of funneling money to extremist groups who are against the USA	The US has to monitor Middle East immigrants more closely if wiretaps & warrants are needed -- "Get them."	Dr. Sami Al-Arian should be tried in Israel	no	Yes	Guilty Mentioned in news . Defendants have ties with extremist groups	Yes	Men connected to terrorist cells innocent people being killed and the attacks on US soil by foreigners 9-11
440	Al Arian fired from USF because he used his position as a Trojan horse to help terrorista	Shocked to learn terrorist activity going on so close to home 43-Same as any other person who cuts down my government or country Go back to your country			no	No decision The government doesn't make claims without a lot of evidence . I believe his name was Dorma and convicted - tapes with Al-Arian	Yes	I still have fears of terrorism
442	C) Giving money to terrorists he is involved with 9/11 murders.	A) This is wrong. About time they were caught.	C) He is guilty. D) No	C) Terrorist and leader of them. D) No/yes	No.	Guilty. 9/11	Yes.	Corruption and money thing is wrong.
443			?	?				
444								

447								
		Funding of terrorists and he worked at the USF and has been involved in hate/terrorists groups.						
448	They were funding the terrorists.	A) Guilty	C) Guilty D) Yes	b	Yes	Guilty	Yes	I think there guilty.
450								
453								
456								
457			Think he is terrorist. D) Yes.	D) Yes.	Yes.	Guilty. Don't like terrorists supporters.	Yes.	Don't like terriots.
461	That Sami Al-Arian financed terrorism.	A) I was appalled and believe he is guilty!	C) That he is guilty of aiding terrorists and their activities. D) Yes.	D) Yes again!	C) Yes.	Guilty. See 44C again!	Yes.	I believe the information regarding Al-Arian's activities I have seen in media and read in paper are correct.
465		x	?					
469		x	b	b				
471		A) At first I found it shocking that this was going on that this was going on so close to home.	C) I feel he is guilty. I find it hard to believe that the government would have indicted him if they didn't have enough proof. They certainly took a long time to investigate. D) I believe, in this case, it would.	D) In this case, yes.	Yes.	Guilty. As I said before, I believe the government has taken more than enough time to investigate and collect the evidence needed.	Yes.	Difficult to say do to the nature of the charges.
472			C) To what degree I do not know but I do not believe he is a white angel or this trial could not be going on. D) Yes.	D) Yes.	Yes.	Guilty. Gut feeling.	Yes.	I don't trust their motives (Arabs or Muslims) too many muslims in our country under false pretexts.
475		A) That he made a big mistake thinking he could hide his involvement.	C) He violated his promise to adhere to American statutes with being a citizen of the US. D) Yes.	D) It would make it highly likely he had his hand dirty.	Yes.	Guilty. His removal from USF. Also his incarceration to date.	Yes.	The middle east has declared themselves. We must take care we don't let our guard down.
476		A) If he is a member of Jihad and has been supporting the killing of Israels, why has he been in our country for so long and why hasn't any done anything until recently?	C) I think he is involved with organizations that support Palestinians killing Israels. D) Yes, some.	C) The addresses and the individuals he started his groups with are suspicious. D) Somewhat.	Yes.	Guilty. Dr. Al-Arian says death to Israels, Americans and their allies then he'll go back and say that's not what he meant. He's	Yes.	Sami Al-Arian used some very strong and hateful words against Israels and Americans. These words are difficult to forget.

						very wishy washy.		
477		A) My reaction is if they are not found guilty they should return home with all their relatives at government expense.	C) Even if the above individuals are not guilty the US should pull their visas/citizenships, etc. & ship the whole family home. D) Yup!	D) Yup!	Yes.	Guilty.	Yes.	I am a victim of my prejudices.
480	C) Too much to state here. Read and followed everything I could. I have a daughter attending USF in Tampa and the jerk was a professor there.	A) Sami Al-Arian looks like a muslim radical to me.	C) He's probably had a hand in fundraising for terrorists organizations. D) What do you think! I saw him all sweaty and and screaming with laundry wrapped around his head on those film clips. Looked obvious to me. C) I think he is guilty of fundraising for terrorists. D) I would say so Yes.		Yes	Guilty. What I've read and seen in the media you can take my vote now and save all that tax payer money.	Yes.	I think he's guilty.
481								
483	x							
486								
487								
488	x	A) Should have been deported. Now it's too late for that. He should go to jail. 43. Death to me, well death to you too!	b	C) He's as guilty as every other terrorist. D) Yes-I would have to convict him.	Yes	Guilty.	Yes	Everything I've read/seen invites guilt. "Where there's smoke there's fire."
489								
493	That the government has a strong case against the above([accused]	A) I believe he's involved somehow.			Yes	Guilty. In my heart I believe he is involved in this.	Yes.	Do not believe the total truth will come out by either side.
496	Sami Al_Arian is funding his native land for war purposes against the UNITED STATES	A) Anger fear how could this happen under our noses.	D) Yes	b	No	Guilty. Al-Arian has too many coincidences leading towards a	No	

						guilty verdict.		
497								